DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 318 253 FL 018 502

AUTHOR Newell, Sanford, Ed.
TITLE Dimension: Languages 68. Proceedings of the Southern Conference on Language Teaching (4th, New Orleans, LA, February 1968).
INSTITUTION Southern Conference on Language Teaching, Spartanburg, SC.
PUB DATE 68
NOTE 99p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Conference Proceedings; Educational Psychology; *Language Teachers; Language Tests; Latin; *Learning Motivation; *Linguistics; Professional Associations; Second Language Instruction; *Teacher Motivation; *Testing

ABSTRACT

Conference papers on aspects of motivation and language teaching include: "Motivate Who?" (Frederick D. Eddy); "Motivation and Language Learning the following: Psychological Aspects" (W. E. Lambert); "Discussion of Professor Lambert's Presentation" (Karl S. Pond); "Linguistics and Motivation" (Robert L. Politzer); "Discussion of Professor Politzer's Presentation" (Patricia O'Connor); "Discussion of Professor Politzer's Presentation" (Edward D. Allen); "Motivation, Language Learning, and the Profession" (Otis H. Green); "Motivation in Language Learning: The Teacher" (Stowell C. Goding); "Discussion of Professor Goding's Presentation" (George W. Ayer); "Discussion of Professor Goding's Presentation" Jacques Hardre); "Testing and Motivation" (Rebecca M. Valette); "Discussion of Professor Valette's Presentation" (Anne Slack); and "Motivation for the Study of Latin" (John F. Latimer). By-laws of the Southern Conference on Language Teaching are also included. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

DIMENSION: LANGUAGES 68

Proceedings of the Fourth Southern
Conference on Language Teaching
New Orleans, February, 1968

Sanford Newell, editor

3

Copyright 1968 by the Southern Conference On Language Teaching.
Box 625, Converse College, Spartanburg, S. C. 29301

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, adapted or translated without permission in writing from the publisher.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 68-18981.

Printed in the United States of America.

Table of Contents

Motivate Who? 1
Frederick D. Eddy

Motivation and Language Learning: Psychological Aspects 6
W. E. Lambert

Discussion of Professor Lambert's Presentation 15
Karl S. Pond

Linguistics and Motivation 19
Robert L. Politzer

Discussion of Professor Politzer's Presentation 32
Patricia O'Connor

Discussion of Professor Politzer's Presentation 34
Edward D. Allen

WORKS AND DAYS:
Motivation, Language Learning, and the Profession 38
Otis H. Green

Motivation In Language Learning: The Teacher 45
Stowell C. Goding

Discussion of Professor Goding's Presentation 56
George W. Ayer

Discussion of Professor Goding's Presentation 61
Jacques Hardré

Testing and Motivation 65
Rebecca M. Valette

Discussion of Professor Valette's Presentation 70
Anne Slack

Motivation for the Study of Latin 75
John F. Latimer

By-Laws of the Southern Conference on Language Teaching 84

PREFACE

The 1968 Southern Conference On Language Teaching, moved from Atlanta for the first time in its brief but influential existence, was as highly successful in New Orleans in February, 1968, as it had been farther east in the region. The Board of Directors felt, upon the conclusion of the Conference, that it had achieved its goal of reaching a somewhat different group of teachers with an important message concerning this exciting profession of ours.

The theme for the 1968 Conference, "Motivation and Language Learning," was very ably treated by the four major speakers, each of whom had two discussants. This format worked generally quite well, and the Directors have decided to continue it in a modified form for at least one subsequent Conference, to be held once again in Atlanta at the Dinkler-Plaza Hotel, February 13-15, 1969.

The addresses presented in this volume of proceedings constitute, without any doubt, an important contribution to the literature of motivation in all school situations, and especially in language teaching and learning. They will probably be especially interesting and informative to those coming in contact with them for the first time. Participants in the 1968 Conference, however, will surely find great value in reading what they heard last February, and have since had time to think about.

It is with great regret that we are unable to publish three of the papers, because we were unable to obtain the manuscripts.

A special feature of this volume of **Dimension** is the listing of all patrons and sponsors of the 1968 Southern Conference On Language Teaching. In addition, we are publishing in this volume the By-Laws of the Conference which constitute the document, approved by the Board of Directors and the members of the Corporation, on the basis of which the Conference is organized and run.

At the meeting of the Board of Directors following the Conference in February, 1968, Karl S. Pond was elected chairman of the 1969 Conference, Sanford Newell was named vice-chairman, and Elisabeth G. Epting was re-elected secretary-treasurer.

Sanford Newell

Converse College

September, 1968

Motivate Who?*

Frederick D. Eddy
University of Colorado

For reasons that are too obvious to mention, my wife and I are delighted to be here with you in this lively, charming city tonight. But let me tell you a few professional reasons why I am particularly happy to be here.

In the first place, it is a source of satisfaction to know that this Conference involves both classical and modern languages. After years of unfortunate separation, the two halves of our great profession are beginning to move ahead on a common front, to the advantage of both and the even greater advantage of American education generally. For my part at least, when you hear me say "language" or "foreign language," you may be sure that I refer to both modern and classical languages.

Secondly, the New Orleans FL program boasts a vigorous FLES component. Having recently lived through two "privileged" communities voting their FLES programs out, I am happy to find myself in a city motivated enough toward FL study to keep its FLES program intact. I congratulate, and I thank, the City of New Orleans! It is in such programs that the highest FL competence is attained, and that a community stays closest to its FL interests, obligations, and achievements.

Next, I am happy to be here because of the subject of the Conference: **Motivation and Language Learning: From Theory to Classroom Practice.** It has long been my feeling that motivation is something we know and do far too little about: the force that drives or pulls the individual student toward the goals set for our FL classrooms. We can take satisfaction in many professional achievements in the past decade or two: applied linguistics, methods, materials — we could all make a long, encouraging list. But we have not done nearly so well with whatever it is that keeps turning a student on — or makes him drop out. Yet this motivation, this basic drive, this will to accomplish and keep going ahead — or to lose interest and quit — is at the heart of everything: not only of conducting a language class, but of running a city, a business, a marriage, a career.

*This chapter was the keynote address on Thursday, February 22, 1968.

I make no attempt to define **motivation** here; that is the work of the entire Conference. And you will find, as the work unfolds over the next two days, that the Program Committee under Sam Newell and Elisabeth Epting has served us well. (It is no surprise, but it is a fact: they have done a fine job.) I have had the privilege of reading advance copies of all of the presentations, and I assure you that we have ahead of us most satisfying and challenging fare. This is my last, but actually most cogent, reason for feeling happy tonight: we have an admirable group of people to lead the thinking of this Conference.

What I would ask you to think about in the next few minutes is both more particular and more general than what goes on in a foreign language classroom and lab. It can be divided into two main parts. In the first part we think about the individual, any individual: you, the guy or the gal sitting next to you, or that you happened (or want) to marry (or divorce) you, or who happens to be your administrative superior (or inferior) on the job, or your colleague, or parent, or son, or daughter . . . or student. We think about why this individual is motivated to do anything, from getting out of bed in the morning to getting back into it at night; about why he does things alone, and why he does things in groups. In short, answering one facet of the question, **Motivate Who?**, we say: **Motivate the individual student,** but not only superficially; motivate him also at the deepest personal levels.

In the second part we ask a broader question: For effective FL learning to take place, do we have to look any farther than the motivation of the student and his teacher? I'm sure you've guessed the answer: **Motivate Who?** brings the general response: **Motivate all those who affect the student.**

Motivate the individual student

Like many of you, I have found in Eric Berne's **Games People Play** some helpful insights into the behavior of individuals. You will recall that he describes basic hungers, one of which, for **recognition,** requires that the individual's presence, and his contribution to the group, be acknowledged. The nature and the extent of the recognition-hunger varies with every individual.[1]

In our classes, as teachers, we are dealing with individuals — 30 at a time is too many, of course, but they are still individuals — each one capable of intense concentration and devotion if properly motivated. Quoting Berne, "the goal of each member of . . . a social

aggregation of two or more people . . . is to obtain as many satisfactions as possible from his transactions with other members. The more accessible he is, the more satisfactions he can obtain."[3] We cannot explore here the how and why of rendering both teacher and student more open ("accessible") in their relations with each other. We can only say that it is the foundation on which all effective learning takes place, and that — like many aspects of our professional activity — it is now passing from the foggy realm of "gift" and "luck" into precise statement and specific know-how. I refer you to an illuminating article by Gertrude Moskowitz to appear in the forthcoming March issue of **Foreign Language Annals,** in which she describes the beneficial effect on teachers and students as individuals, and on the teaching and learning process, of teachers' learning to observe and evaluate the personal "climate" that they create in their own classrooms.[4]

I cannot leave this subject of deep personal motivation without underlining a principle that most of you know already. My wife and I discovered it as we struggled to bring up our two boys: to get them to "understand" what was "right," and all that sort of thing. I have found it true in every teaching situation: **No one ever listens to answers unless he himself has asked the question.** When a student is pursuing the answer to a question he has asked spontaneously, or has been brought to ask by the situation in which he finds himself, then and only then does he hear the answer a teacher or a textbook gives him. Otherwise, he very efficiently turns them both off.

Motivate those who affect the student

Obviously our goal is to motivate the student to learn and to act. But we cannot approach the student as though he existed like a hermit on an island. Even when we consider student and teacher together, we are seeing only the tip of the iceberg that shows above the surface. They are surrounded by people and situations, every one of them influencing one way or another their attitude toward FL learning. If the list I give you rapidly now seems difficult to think about in so few minutes, take heart: many of the themes suggested here will occur in the papers we will hear and discuss tomorrow and the next day.

The Student. As a student plans and then begins the study of a foreign language, what influences — besides those of his teacher — are brought to bear on his will to achieve? I suggest the following, with a note that the list is of course open-ended. In each case, if the influence is negative, or indifferent (which is the same as negative),

the teacher and the student have that much more to overcome:

1. The parents and siblings in the home. How are "foreigners" referred to around the dinner table?
2. The playmates and contemporaries at school. What do they think of Mexicans?
3. The news media: TV, radio, the press. What picture do they give, say, of France and the French?
4. The administrators, counselors, and teachers in the school. What does the use of a foreign language mean to them?
5. The designers and producers of the student's FL learning materials. Have they given him materials that motivate learning, or discourage it?

The Teacher. Some of our FL teachers are highly motivated, and this helps to motivate their students. Whether a teacher is motivated or not, I submit, depends on a number of people, some of whom never — or very seldom — see his classroom. Their influence is none the less deeply felt there:

1. The college or university staff who trained him, and who watch —or should watch — his progress in the profession for at least two years after graduation;
2. The department chairman who supervises his work — constructively, indifferently, or negatively;
3. The more experienced colleague who teaches in the next room, concerned and open, or indifferent and closed off;
4. The administrator who hires and promotes him, or suffers with him;
5. Again, the professionals who design and produce his teaching materials — to his joy and satisfaction, or to his daily misery.

All of these people who influence so tellingly the attitudes of our students and teachers, we as a profession must know them, learn how to reach them, to help them create the kind of climate in which our work can go forward effectively. To do this, we must prove ourselves to be men and women of good will, adult in our approach to explanation and discussion, open to the real people that face us — and yet never lose our child-like enthusiasm, savoring the joys of exploring other lands and other peoples.

We must learn how to "level" with each individual student, knowing that, until we do, we **manipulate** him, we do not **work with** him, nor he with us. In the community that surrounds us, we must learn how to share the deep, personal satisfactions that are characteristics of FL learning — perhaps the most human of all the humanities, since it brings us close to people otherwise inaccessible.

I hear some of you saying, perhaps, "This sounds like a public-relations job." To some extent it probably is. But "public relations" sounds self-seeking, and we are involved in deeper things. To motivate that little kid in the last row, farthest from the window, you must let him know that you have a heart. To motivate the community that surrounds him and you, you must find ways of letting them hear the great heart-beat of this profession of ours, which encompasses all men and women speaking all the tongues of the earth, past and present. What could be more generously human than that?

1—Berne, Eric. **Games People Play.** Dell (paper). Grove Press, New York, 1967, pages 14-15
2—op. cit. pages 18-19
3—Moskowitz, Gertrude. "The Effects of Training Foreign Language Teachers in Interaction Analysis." FLA Vol. I, No. 3 (March 1968) pp. 218-235

Motivation and Language Learning: Psychological Aspects

W. E. Lambert
McGill University

Psychologists devote a good deal of thought and experimentation to the concepts of motivation and learning and the various ways motivation and learning interact. When the focus is on simple habits and how they develop into organized sequences of behavior, it is relatively easy to demonstrate and to explain this interplay. As two leading theorists (Miller & Dollard, 1941[1]) have put it, learning, especially in its relatively simple forms, takes place when the learner wants something, notices something, does something, and receives something. Their view is that learning requires the interplay of four essential components: motivation (the wanting aspect), perception (the noticing aspect), responding (the doing aspect), and reward or reinforcement (the receiving aspect). By way of illustration, consider a maze learning experiment with animal subjects. Suppose we attempt to set motivation to zero or eliminate its influence by reducing to a minimum the animal's wants for food by letting him eat to satiation just before the experiment proper is started. Compared to hungry control animals who are enticed by food to learn the route to the goal of the maze, the sated animal would be a poorer learner of the puzzle, as expected by the theorists, but, and this is the important point, the animal would still poke and sniff around the maze, and if tested later when hungry, he would demonstrate that he had incidentally learned a good deal in just poking around. Note what is happening in this simple example: one motivational system (the biological one concerned with food needs) has been eliminated, while another system, just as potent, that concerned with needs to poke around and explore, has replaced it. Even at the animal level, one would have an impossible time trying to set all motive systems to zero; one group of motives or another would always be there to have a powerful effect on learning.

When more complicated forms of learning are involved, as in first language learning where complex sets of linguistic regularities and semantic concepts must be mastered by human infants, there is a great difference in the complexity of what the learner wants, notices, does and receives. The case of second language learning, as it com-

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Gratman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

monly occurs in school, seems to me to fall somewhere between maze learning or developing skill in typing and first language acquisition in its degree of complexity and its rate of development. Thus it is a special case of language acquisition that can be described and explained more easily than first language learning because it runs its course in slow motion, relatively. As a consequence, we have been able to make a start in explaining the processes of both teaching and learning second languages, and it may be of interest to you to consider what types of motive systems are likely called into play and what role these systems play in the acquisition of second-language skills.

One can very profitably view the learning of a second language in much the same way that Mowrer views the child's learning of the first language.[3] Mowrer's fascinating "autistic" theory differs in an essential manner from Skinner's more mechanical approach to the problem.[4] For Mowrer, word learning for talking birds and for children takes place when the **sounds** of words have come to carry a reinforcement power in themselves so that the learner **wants** to produce words. The sounds become reinforcing agents themselves through the association the infant makes between the nice qualities of certain people and the words they use. First language learning is motivated by basic desires to communicate with, to become similar to, and to belong with valued people in one's environment, first family members and then others in the linguistic community. In other terms, the infant language learner has to identify with language users to the extent that he wants to be like them in many ways, and this includes learning their code and the distinctive ways they use their code. It is not a simple case of a child emitting words and immediately being reinforced, as Skinner seems to suggest. Instead, Mowrer argues that the word sounds used by valued people in the infant's life space take on a reinforcing quality of their own and this is sufficient to bring the words into existence and to serve as the base for the acquisition of the more complex features of the language.

In similar fashion, several of us who have considered the matter carefully have come to believe that the successful learner of a second language also has to identify with members of another linguistic-cultural group and be willing to take on very subtle aspects of their behavior, including their distinctive style of speech and their language. We also feel that there are various types of motivation which can underlie his willingness to be like another group's members. For example, the learner may find that in mastering certain features of another social group's language he has made the crucial step in be-

coming an acculturated part of a second linguistic-cultural community. Advancing toward bi-culturality in this sense may be viewed in some cases as a broadening experience. If pushed beyond a point, however, this progress in a second language could engender a feeling of not comfortably belonging in one social group or the other. With a different orientation, a language learner may look on his learning task as making him better educated or more cultured, or as equipping him with a useful skill for his future occupation, with little regard for the culture or the people represented by the other language. In other circumstances, one might consider learning another group's language as a means of getting on the "inside" of a cultural community in order to exploit, manipulate or control, with clearly personal ends in mind.

A series of studies carried out at McGill has been concerned with such topics, and various findings have increased our confidence in a social-psychological theory of language learning. This theory, in brief, holds that an individual successfully acquiring a second language gradually adopts various aspects of behavior which characterize members of another linguistic-cultural group. The learner's ethnocentric tendencies, his attitudes toward the other group, and his orientation toward language learning are believed to regulate or control his motivation to learn and ultimately his success or failure in mastering the new language. His orientation is thought of as being "instrumental" in form if the purposes of language study reflect the more utilitarian value of linguistic achievement, such as getting ahead in one's occupation if he masters the language, and "integrative" if the student is oriented to learn more about the other cultural community as if he desired to belong to or become a potential member of the other group. It is also argued that some may be anxious to learn another language as a means of being accepted in another cultural group because of dissatisfactions experienced in their own culture, while others may be as interested in another culture as they are in their own. However, the more proficient one becomes in a second language, the more he may find that his place in his original membership group is modified at the same time as the other linguistic-cultural group becomes something more than a **reference** group for him. It may, in fact, become a second and competing **membership** group for him. Depending upon the compatibility of the two cultures, he may experience feelings of chagrin or regret as he loses ties in one group, mixed with the fearful anticipation of entering a relatively new group. The concept "anomie" first proposed by Durkheim,[4] and more recently extended by Srole[5] and Williams,[6] refers to the feelings of social uncertainty or dissatisfaction

which we believe characterize serious students of a second language and those who become bilingual.

Perhaps the elements of this theory and their implications for language teachers will become more meaningful if we examine briefly the basic research studies that gave the theory its present form.

The first studies[7] were carried out in 1959 through 1961 with English-speaking Montreal high school students studying French. They were all carefully tested for their language learning aptitude and verbal intelligence as well as their attitudes toward French people and the French Canadian community, the intensity of their motivation to learn French, and their orientations toward learning the language. Our measure of motivational intensity is conceptually similar to Jones' index of interest in learning a language that he found to be important for successful language learning among Welsh students.[8] A factor analysis indicated that aptitude and intelligence formed one factor that was statistically independent of a second comprising indices of motivation, type of orientation toward language, and social attitudes toward French-Canadians. Furthermore, the measure of achievement in French used (final overall grade) was reflected equally prominently in both factors. This means that achievement in French was dependent upon both aptitude and intelligence on the one hand, and a sympathetic orientation toward the other linguistic-cultural group on the other. The orientation apparently sustained a strong motivation to learn the other group's language and led to better performance in French at the end of the year. It was also made clear that students with an integrative orientation were the more successful in language learning when compared with those more instrumentally oriented. (We have not concentrated on the manipulative orientation mentioned earlier and we are aware that a certain degree of error in classifying students may occur until attention is given to this form of orientation).

In summary, this study indicated that two quite independent factors are important in learning a second language: a) general language-learning aptitude, and b) a favorable attitude toward the other linguistic group, coupled with a sympathetic orientation toward learning that group's language. The fact that these determinants are independent means, first, that they do not correlate (thus, knowing a student's aptitude score does not help one predict his attitude or motivations), and second, that a person without aptitude can learn the language well if the attitude and motivation are strong, at the same time as a person with unfavorable attitudes and motivation can do well if his aptitude

is strong. It follows, too, that a person with both aptitude and the proper orientation will be particularly likely to do well in the study of a second language.

Robert Gardner's 1960 study confirmed and extended these findings. Using a larger sample of English-Canadian high school students and incorporating various measures of French achievement, the same two independent factors were revealed, and again both were related to French achievement. But whereas aptitude and achievement were especially important for those French skills stressed in school training (e.g., grammar and vocabulary), the acquisition of audio-lingual skills was determined primarily by measures of the attitudes, motivation, and orientations of the students. Further evidence indicated that the component elements that make up the integrative motive are very similar in nature to those that form the democratic or non-authoritarian ideological syndrome, and this finding opens up the possibility that basic personality dispositions may be involved in language learning efficiency.

In the 1960 study, information had also been gathered from parents about their orientation toward the French-Canadian community. These data suggested that the student's orientation toward the other group is developed within the family. That is, students with an integrative disposition to learn French had parents who also were integrative and sympathetic to the French community. The students' orientations, however, were not related to their parents' skill in French nor to the number of French acquaintances the parents had, indicating that the integrative motive is less likely due to having experience with the French language at home than to some favorable, family-wide attitudinal disposition toward French-Canadian people.

A study by Moshe Anisfeld and myself[8] extended the experimental procedure to samples of Jewish high school students studying Hebrew at parochial schools in Montreal. They were administered tests measuring their orientation toward learning Hebrew and their attitudes toward the Jewish culture and community, as well as tests of verbal intelligence and language aptitude. These tests were compared with measures of achievement in the Hebrew language at the end of the school year. The results support the generalization that both intellectual capacity and attitudinal orientation affect success in learning Hebrew. However, whereas intelligence and linguistic aptitude are relatively stable predictors of success, the attitudinal measures vary from one social-class district of the city to another. A measure of a Jewish student's desire to become more acculturated into the Jewish tradition did

relate to achievement in Hebrew for children in a district of Montreal where Jewish parents were concerned with problems of keeping Jewish traditions while adjusting to their own middle-class community. In another district, made up of Jews more recently arrived in North America who were clearly of a lower socio-economic class level, the measure of desire for Jewish acculturation did not correlate with achievement in Hebrew, whereas measures of pro-Semitic attitudes or pride in being Jewish did. Thus, the interplay of aptitude, attitudes, and motivation was more complex but very similar when the other language being learned was Hebrew.

More recently, students undergoing an intensive course in French at McGill's French Summer School were examined for changes in attitude during the study period.[10] These were mainly American university students or secondary school language teachers who referred themselves more to the European-French than the American-French community in their orientations to language learning. In this study, we found that feelings of anomie increased markedly during the course of study. As students progressed to the point that they said they "thought" and even dreamed in French, their feelings of anomie, as measured by Srole's scale of anomie, also increased. At the same time, they began, for the first time, to use English in various situations even though they had pledged to use only French for the six-week period. The pattern suggests that these advanced students of French experienced feelings of social upset when they concentrated on and commenced to really master the second language and, as a consequence, we hypothesize that they developed stratagems, such as reverting to English, to control or minimize such feelings.

In another study[11] we compared 10-year old monolingual and bilingual students on measures of intelligence. Of relevance here is the fact that bilingual children have markedly more favorable attitudes toward both language communities than do the monolingual children. Furthermore, the parents of bilingual children hold the same strongly sympathetic attitudes toward both groups in contrast to the parents of monolingual children, suggesting to us that the development of linguistic skills in a second language, extending to the point of bilingualism, is controlled or at least influenced by family-shared attitudes toward the other linguistic-cultural community.

The most recent investigation has been conducted this year outside of Quebec in a mainly English-Canadian Ontario community by Drs. H. J. Feenstra and R. C. Gardner.[12] Their results, based on tests of grade

9 high school students' performance in French, also reveal the importance of attitudes toward the other language group for the degree of achievement reached in learning that group's language. They also found a direct interplay between parents' attitudes toward French-Canadians and their children's achievement in learning French.

These findings are consistent and reliable enough to be of more general interest. Because of the possible practical as well as theoretical significance of this approach, it seemed appropriate to test its applicability in a cultural setting other than the bi-cultural Quebec or Ontario. Accordingly, another investigation was conducted in various regional settings in the United States, two of them also bi-cultural and a third more representative of "typical" urban American cities.[18] The bi-cultural settings permitted us to examine the role of attitudes working two ways: attitudinal dispositions of American students toward linguistic minority groups in their immediate environment, and the attitudes of members of the cultural minority group toward the general American culture about them. In this study, we were interested in comparing the importance for second language learning of intellectual ability and language learning aptitude, on the one hand, and social attitudes toward the "other" language group and motivation to learn the language, on the other. Our attention was first directed to an examination of how these variables affect the language learning of American students who come from homes where only English is spoken. In order to compare the results of the U. S. investigation with earlier studies carried out with English-speaking students learning French in Montreal, we chose two samples of students from bi-cultural communities in Louisiana and Maine. A third sample of students was drawn from the public school system of Hartford, Connecticut. The Connecticut setting did not have a distinctive sub-community of Franco-Americans in its immediate environment comparable to those in the Louisiana and Maine districts studied. Thus, the Hartford students would not be expected to have a distinctive linguistic-cultural group in their immediate experience toward which favorable or unfavorable atitudes would have developed through direct contact.

As in our earlier work, a large battery of tests was administered to these students early in the year, and, near the end of the year, tests of achievement in French were given, and grades in French were obtained from teachers. The tests were intercorrelated and factor-analyzed. The results were similar to those of the Montreal studies; in the American case, two independent factors also underlie the development of skill in learning a second language: intellectual capacity

and an appropriate attitudinal orientation toward the other language group coupled with a strong motivation to learn the language.

The second phase of the investigation was concerned with the roles of language-learning aptitude, motivation, and attitudes in the linguistic development of potentially bilingual Franco-American students — those coming from homes in which French was the major language spoken. Two samples of Franco-American high school students were chosen from the Louisiana and Maine settings. The analysis indicated that the young person's attitudes toward his own linguistic group and the American culture around him influence his progress in mastering both English and French. If he faces and resolves his cultural conflict so that he can view himself as both American and French he will develop good skill in both languages. If he resolves the conflict by emphasizing either his French or American heritage he reflects this form of adjustment by developing a dominance in one language at the expense of the other. Incidentally, when the attitudes of the Franco-American students from Louisiana were compared with those from Maine, it became clear that the community studied in Maine enjoys a comparatively dynamic and distinctively French existence while the Louisiana group seemed to be more rapidly merging into the general American society. For example, the Maine Franco-Americans show a decided superiority over the American students in their French skills whereas the Louisiana Franco-Americans show little or no advantage in French over American students.

Furthermore, when we examined the stereotypes which both American and Franco-American students hold of French people, we found that all groups except one have generally unfavorable stereotypes of French people. Again, the Franco-Americans from Maine were the exception, and they gave evidence of a basic pride in their French heritage. The consequences of holding negative stereotypes toward the very people whose language one is supposed to learn became apparent in this analysis.

We also looked into the various values American students bring to the language-learning process. The results indicated that achievement in foreign language training is not the central goal for most American students. Rather it is apparently incidental to the more challenging goal of trying to find and prepare one's way for the future. Intelligence coupled with a value placed on achievement are major determiners of success in most school work, including the study of language. This, I feel, represents an interesting challenge for language teachers because if they could get below the achievement motive or

harness it to more appropriate motives, the whole business of teaching languages might take on a quite different complexion.

What might be the significance of these findings for teachers of second or foreign languages? As I see it, both the results and the structure of the investigations described should be **instructive** for many language teachers who, because of pressures on their time to teach the routine introduction to a foreign language to large numbers of students, may lose sight of the fascinating events taking place within the minds and the emotions of their students. We social psychologists have already won over a small number of enthusiastic converts from the language teaching profession who saw some value and some enjoyment in taking part in research of the type outlined here. Because of their skills and experience they contribute a great deal to what little progress has been made so far in attempts to unravel the processes of teaching and learning foreign languages. We are still proselytizing, mind you, because there is so much yet to be known. For those who have to stay at the front lines with students, perhaps they will see somewhat more clearly the significance of their role as interest stimulators, convincing students that foreign language is much more than maze learning, that it is the code of a different and interesting social group. The challenge is to go beyond the mere achievement motives of students and to link language teaching with more appropriate and more productive motives.

1—Miller, N. E. & Dollard, J. **Social learning and imitation.** New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941.
2—Mowrer, O. H. **Learning theory and the symbolic processes.** New York: Wiley, 1960.
3—Skinner, B. F. **Science and human behavior.** New York: Macmillan, 1953.
4—Durkheim, E. **Le suicide.** Paris: Alcan, 1897.
5—Srole, L. "Social dysfunction, personality and social distance attitudes." Paper given at the American Sociological Society, 1951, Chicago, Illinois.
6—Williams, R. M. **American Society.** New York: Knopf, 1952.
7—Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. "Motivational variables in second-language acquisition." **Canadian Journal of Psychology,** 1959, **13,** 266-272; Gardner, R. C. **Motivational variables in second-language acquisition.** Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, McGill University, Redpath Library, 1960.
8—Jones, W. R. "Attitude towards Welsh as a second language. A preliminary investigation." **British Journal of Educational Psychology,** 1949, **19,** 44-52; Jones, W. R. "Attitude towards Welsh as a second language. A further investigation." **British Journal of Educational Psychology,** 1950, **20,** 117-132.
9—Anisfeld, M., & Lambert, W. E. "Social and psychological variables in learning Hebrew." **Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,** 1961, **63,** 524-529.
10—Lambert, W. E., Gardner, R. C., Barik, H. C., & Tunstall, K. "Attitudinal and cognitive aspects of intensive study of a second language." **Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,** 1963, Vol. 66, No. 4, pp. 358-368.
11—Peal, Elizabeth, & Lambert, W. E. "The relation of bilingualism to intelligence." **Psychological Monographs,** 1962, No. 546, Vol. 76, No. 27, pp. 1-23.
12—Feenstra, H. J. **Aptitude, attitude and motivation in second-language acquisition.** Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. The University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, 1967.
13—Lambert, W. E., Gardner, R. C., Olton, R., & Tunstall, K. **A study of the roles of attitudes and motivation in second-language learning.** Mimeographed. McGill University, 1962.

Discussion of Professor Lambert's Presentation

Karl S. Pond
Miami-Dade Junior College

Doctor Lambert pointed out in his paper that "two quite independent factors are important in learning a second language: a) general language learning aptitude, and b) a favorable attitude towards the other linguistic group, coupled with a sympathetic orientation towards learning that group's language."

Earlier in his paper, he also stated, "The case of second language learning, as it commonly occurs in school, seems to me to fall somewhere between maze learning or developing skills in typing and first language acquisition in its degree of complexity and its rate of development."

It is to these two crucial points that I shall address myself. It seems to me that the question which we must face at this point is simply this: What can we, as second language teachers, do to utilize the knowledge given to us by Dr. Lambert and his fellow psychologists in order to facilitate language learning by our students?

The first important factor seems to be language learning aptitude. Perhaps, in view of this fact, we should limit second language learning opportunities only to those who show that they possess such aptitude as measured by standard tests. This, however, does not seem to be a realistic answer for two basic reasons.

First, such a practice would lead to the logical abolition of a second language requirement for any group of students, since it could then be successfully argued that some students in the group might not possess the required aptitude. Perhaps such a step would be logical and may long be overdue. I fear, however, that such a step is not feasible at this time, in view of our professional traditions.

Secondly, it is obvious that aptitude is only one variable in successful language learning, and that in many cases it can be overcome by

an increase in motivation in the learner. Clearly then, it seems that our immediate problem is to increase motivation in our students.

According to the results of Dr. Lambert's studies, a prime factor to this end is "a sympathetic orientation toward the other linguistic group, coupled with a sympathetic orientation towards learning that group's language." This, as well as Mowrer's studies mentioned by Dr. Lambert, indicates to me that we must create or increase our students' admiration for the culture of the people whose language they are attempting to learn. My experience is that it is not difficult to do this superficially, but that it becomes quite a difficult task when you attempt to do it to a level where it will sufficiently motivate students to the sustained individual efforts necessary for successful language learning. To facilitate this goal, I would suggest three lines of action. One, frequent small doses of information designed to win the students' sympathy towards the target culture rather than large doses at long intervals. Two, that we make an effort to understand what our students value and admire, so that we may present them with target culture values that they will admire and/or wish to emulate. Too often what we value and what the students value are quite different. To a ninth grader the ability to produce a supersonic passenger plane may be much more admirable than the ability to produce an exquisite sonnet; or the ability of a people to accept persons who are different might be more admirable than the production of an architectural masterpiece. This factor should be taken seriously into consideration when choosing teaching materials, from the point of view of both text and visual. Three, it seems to me that the students, especially at the early stages, make a close association between the teacher and the culture he is attempting to teach. Rightly or wrongly, and to varying degrees, the students look upon you as representing the target culture, and, by extension, will often like or dislike, feel sympathy or antipathy, depending on how they feel toward you.

Feelings, then, are important factors in motivation, and it behooves us to pay particular attention to the students' feelings. Students often learn in order to increase feeling good or in order to decrease anxiety. Many students come to second language learning full of anxieties and negative feelings. Our primary task, in the early stage of language learning, should be to negate these negative feelings and anxieties and to make the students feel good about themselves and, by extension, towards language learning.

There are many ways to accomplish these ends. My own pet device is what I would like to refer to as "success motivation."

The "success motivation" is based on four prime factors:

1) A small objective, well-defined in behavioral terms.

2) Acceptance by the learner that this objective is desirable and necessary in order to achieve a larger objective.

3) Ample opportunity for each learner to have the practice necessary to reach the objective.

4) A meaningful reward for having accomplished the objective.

Dialogue memorization may be taken as an illustration. Whether or not it is a necessary objective in order to successfully learn to speak a language is debatable and is used only as an example. The point is that I choose at this time to believe it is a necessary objective. The second point is that the students are made to believe that it is a necessary objective.

We are often told by our college colleagues that this is one activity which seems impossible to achieve in beginning classes. Students are afraid to perform in front of others and refuse to put forth consistently the effort necessary for fairly smooth recitations. In spite of that, however, students in my classes not only accept this task, but actually feel cheated when, on purpose, I skip this phase of the weekly program once in a while. Why do my students accept and want this activity?

First, because the dialogues are short. Secondly, because they believe in it. Thirdly, because they know that they will receive my praise; that if they freeze and forget a line or a word, I will cheerfully help them; and that they will not be publicly criticized. Last, but not least, they know that they will receive a grade of 95, which will be averaged with the lower writing grade for the week, and that it will therefore substantially increase their weekly grade.

The important thing is not only the structures memorized, it is the fact that they have succeeded and, having succeeded, they feel good! Their anxieties have been decreased.

The first point made by Dr. Lambert refers to the habit formation part of learning and refers to the work of Miller and Dollard. Their view, he states, is that learning requires the interplay of four essential

components: motivation (the wanting aspect), perception (the noticing aspect), responding (the doing aspect), and reward or reinforcement (the receiving aspect).

If personal success is an important factor in motivation, it seems to me that the other three aspects of learning are important if individual success is to be achieved.

If perception is important (the noticing aspect), I would suggest that we make use of teaching materials which emphasize linguistic analogy (patterning) instead of confusing mixed forms or syntax at too early a stage, so that even the student with little language aptitude will have a chance to perceive.

If responding is important, we should arrange our materials and class activities in such a way as to get the maximum of individual responses, rather than spend our time in re-explaining what the book has already explained.

If reward is important, then let us give our students ample group practice before we call on the individual, so that the chances for a correct answer and accompanying praise are good.

Feelings and attitudes of the learners are important. The learner who, during the course of the first week, is called upon 20 times and who gives only 4 acceptable answers, will soon begin to dislike the course, the target culture, himself, and the instructor. The opposite, I feel, is often true of the learner who gives 16 acceptable answers. In repeated individual success, there seems to exist a strong motivational factor. Individual success and the creation of positive attitudes towards the target culture are motivational tools which may not always succeed in overcoming lack of aptitude or lack of general intelligence; but, it seems to me that common sense tells us that these tools, at least, might be partial answers, worthy of our attention and serious consideration.

Linguistics and Motivation

Robert L. Politzer
Stanford University

I should like to precede this discussion with three statements:

1. Motivation of the learner is undoubtedly one of the most important factors in the acquisition of a second language.
2. Linguistics — the study of the structure of language or of a possible model of the "generation" of language—has, as such, no relation to the problem of motivation.
3. Linguistics has been, if not the exclusive, at least the primary force which has helped to shape the new foreign language curricula and approaches to foreign language teaching which have been developed during the past decade and which have often been referred to as the "New Key" to language teaching.

The above statements have a corollary: it is indeed possible to apply linguistics to language teaching and to extend procedures founded in linguistics to the classroom situation without paying attention to motivation — one of the most important factors involved in the learning situation. I am very much afraid that, in many situations at least, this is indeed exactly what happened when linguistics was applied to language teaching. This disregard of motivation is not a necessary aspect of linguistically oriented language teaching — but I believe that it can be explained to some extent at least by the history of applied linguistics within the United States.

As I and others have pointed out on several occasions,[1] linguistics made its impact on foreign language teaching primarily through two channels of approach: (1) the study of so-called exotic languages initiated in the early 1940's by special programs of the American Council of Learned Societies, and (2) the teaching of American English as a foreign language, which began to be developed as a very special technical discipline also in the early 1940's, especially in centers like the English Language Institute of the University of Michigan. The first approach, which was later taken up also in the study of less exotic languages in the Army Special Training Programs, was characterized

primarily by the use of native informants and the memorization of dialogues in a so-called "mim-mem" (mimicry-memorization) methodology. The second approach — the one taken, for instance, by the English Language Institute of the University of Michigan — featured teaching materials based on contrastive analysis and introduced certain discovery procedures of structural linguistics (e.g., substitution in the same "slot" of a pattern) as teaching devices.

The so-called "New Key" or the "audio-lingual" approach represents to a large extent the combination of the two approaches just mentioned: in the typical lesson the student is asked to memorize a dialogue, then he goes through the process of performing substitution or transformation type drills which concentrate on a particular aspect of the foreign language which has been revealed as difficult by contrastive analysis. The lesson is likely to lead to a "generalization"— a statement concerning some grammatical feature of the foreign language. At the same time, however, there is heavy emphasis on practice and habit formation. This practice takes place in the classroom as well as in the laboratory, where the student often repeats the exercises which he has already been exposed to in the classroom. The purpose of the repetition is to "overlearn" certain responses; in other words, even after the student has already learned to give the correct response, he may be required to give it several more times so that the tie between the stimulus and response becomes strengthened and automatic. Another aspect of the laboratory drill often consists in the fact that, after a time allotted for the student's response, the correct response is given on the tape. This correct response has the purpose of confirming and thus "rewarding" the correct response given by the student.

What has all this to do with the motivation of the student? The answer, I believe, is quite simple: **nothing** — or rather the procedures just described take for granted that the student's interest and motivation are rather high. In the situation in which linguistics made its initial impact upon language teaching, this assumption was undoubtedly justified: the individuals who learned "exotic" foreign languages before and during World War II had very good motives for doing so. The soldiers who learned foreign languages under the ASTP may or may not always have had the best intrinsic motives — but **not** wanting to end up in an Infantry Replacement Training Center may have represented quite an important incentive, in some cases at least. The foreign student coming to the United States has to improve his command of American English if he wants to accomplish the goals and reach the aims which brought him to this country.

In applying, in the college or especially the high school classroom, the methods and lessons learned in intensive programs for highly motivated adults, we have to proceed with great care and we cannot simply assume that what worked in one situation will automatically work in another. The learner who knows that perhaps quite literally his life may depend on learning to use certain phrases quickly and automatically will be willing and eager to "overlearn" certain responses. If he gives a correct response, the confirmation of his response may indeed be a reward. A learner who perceives only little incentive for learning a foreign language may be bored to death by overlearning procedures. Just how much of a "reward" the confirmation of his correct response in the laboratory represents will, of course, depend entirely on just how much he is interested in making this correct response in the first place.

As language teachers we must try our best to improve our students' motivation — and most certainly we must never stifle it by using teaching procedures which create boredom or apathy. Just how to motivate the student, how to arouse his interest, how to make him feel the need for language study is, of course, a very complex and difficult subject. I should like to comment on it very briefly from two points of view — that of the total curriculum and that of the individual lesson.

As far as the total curriculum is concerned, the "New Key" audiolingual approach takes cognizance — with a great deal of justification — of the fact that it takes time to acquire language skills. Reading is learned best after listening and speaking skills have been introduced. It must be learned gradually — the student cannot be overwhelmed by the sudden introduction of large numbers of vocabulary items. Free expression is the goal of the curriculum to be reached in the last levels. It must be reached gradually: the first levels of the curriculum emphasize listening, repetition, minimal manipulation of patterns. I certainly do not want to quarrel with these assumptions or question their basic correctness. But there is one danger that we must watch out for: if we empty the initial stages or first levels of the curriculum of all real interest and challenge, if we insist that they consist primarily in listening to and repeating rather uninspiring materials, then our students may simply not last through the initial levels. I think that we quite rightly rejected the old grammar translation two-year curriculum which tried to provide intellectual challenge by having the student learn and apply complicated grammatical rules and which pretended that a student could really learn to read works of great difficulty and

linguistic complexity after a two year exposure. But with all its faults, the old curriculum did at least attempt to provide an intellectual challenge and face the student with worthwhile materials during his first and certainly his second year of language study. We must make sure that in replacing the old curriculum by the new, we retain the possibility of intellectual challenge and presentation of worthwhile materials for our students. Again, I do not pretend to have a generally valid recipe as to how this may be done. Besides, just what kind of materials may be considered interesting and worthwhile will depend on the individual class, as well as on the teacher. The materials may range from a "real" ad in a "real" foreign language newspaper to an important but simple poem. I should also like to emphasize here a point which I have made elsewhere,[8] namely, that we could put more intellectual content into the initial levels of the foreign language curriculum by teaching the student a bit more about language. I do not advocate replacing language courses by courses in linguistics — but to the experts in motivation "the value of children knowing the reasons for their activity seems obvious."[9] So, in the very interest of keeping their motivation alive during the initial stages of foreign language instruction, we certainly could tell the college and high school students about the purpose of comparing minimal pairs like **rue/roue** and the theory behind the substitution drills which they are performing.

The real challenge to the teacher, however, lies in making interesting and rewarding the language practice which is a necessary and inevitable part of lower levels of the curriculum. Here again let me emphasize that the linguistic principles and linguistically based methodology are neutral — they can be used to teach a lesson that is interesting and motivating, or to teach one that is dull and uninspiring. In order to illustrate my point, I should like to compare two units or lessons, both dealing with the same materials but taught by different teachers, both of whom are utilizing linguistically based pattern practice techniques. The performances which I shall describe will be only partly fictional. They are, in fact, largely based on the observation of lessons which were videotaped in connection with the teacher training program at Stanford.

The lesson is a familiar one, a French lesson entitled, **Au restaurant.** Its main grammatical purpose is to introduce the student to the partitive article **(I am eating bread=Je mange du pain),** and to the so-called idiomatic expressions with **avoir(have): I am hungry=J'ai faim.** The lesson is based on a dialogue which goes approximately like

this (the dialogue is a composite and not a direct quotation from any particular text book):

A: J'ai faim.

B: Moi aussi, j'ai faim et j'ai soif.

A: Alors, allons déjeuner. Voici un restaurant.

B: Voici une table libre et voilà un garçon.

A: Garçon, apportez-moi la carte, s'il vous plaît.

Garçon: La carte n'est pas encore prête. Mais le déjeuner est prêt.

A: Alors, apportez-moi des hors d'oeuvres et du vin rouge.

Garçon: Nous avons seulement du vin blanc.

A: Du vin blanc, alors. Qu'est-ce que vous avez comme viande?

Garçon: Nous avons du chou-croûte garni et du rosbif. Et comme légumes, il y a des haricots verts, des petit-pois, et des pommes de terres frites.

A: Apportez-moi du rosbif et des haricots verts.

Garçon: Qu'est-ce que vous voulez comme dessert?

A: Avez-vous des pommes et du fromage? etc.*

Now let us follow two teachers into the classroom to see what they did with the lesson.

Teacher X: 1. X explained to his class that this would be a lesson about going to a restaurant and ordering meals. Then he proceeded to

---

*[A: I am hungry.
B: I too am hungry and thirsty.
A: OK. Let's eat. Here is a restaurant.
B: Here is a table and there is a waiter.
A: Waiter, please bring me the menu.
Waiter: The menu is not ready yet, but lunch is ready.
A: Please bring me some hors d'oeuvres and some red wine.
Waiter: We have only white wine.
A: OK, some white wine. What kind of meat do you have?
Waiter: We have "chou-croûte garni" and roast beef, and for vegetables there are string beans, peas, and fried potatoes.
A: Bring me roast beef and string beans.
Waiter: What would you like for dessert?
A: Do you have apples and cheese? etc.

explain what was going to happen in the dialogue: "A says that he is hungry. B is also hungry. They decide to go to a restaurant. A sees an empty table. They see a waiter, etc."

2. Next, teacher X started the process of having the class memorize the dialogue. This he did by briefly giving the English meaning of each sentence, modeling it in French, and asking for choral repetition. After having gone through the whole dialogue, he started over again by asking for individual and then choral repetitions. The last 20 minutes of the lesson were spent in the language laboratory where the pupils listened over and over again to the dialogue and repeated each sentence after listening to it.

3. The next class session started again with the memorization of the dialogue. This time X tried to take either the part of the waiter or A and have the class give the responses of the other partner in the dialogue. The last 20 minutes of the lesson were again spent listening to the dialogue in the laboratory.

4. The third session spent on the unit began again with the learning of the dialogue. This time X tried to have individual students act out the parts. Some did fairly well, most needed considerable prompting. While some individuals were acting out the dialogue, some other members of the class seemed to lose interest in the procedure. Teacher X became aware of this rather quickly. He decided to assign different parts of the dialogue to certain groups in the class who had to respond in chorus. The lab activity in the last 20 minutes of the class was identical with the one of the first class session. "We still haven't got that dialogue," said Teacher X.

5. The next class session started with pattern practice. Teacher X used the sentences, **J'ai faim** and **J'ai soif** first. He explained that the drill would consist in his suggesting a substitute for the subject of the sentence. The class would respond by providing the sentence with the different subject.

X: J'ai soif. Nous . . .

Class: Nous avons soif.

Next the sentences, **Je mange du pain. Je bois du café.** and **Voulez-vous des pommes de terres?** were selected for substitution drills. Teacher X suggested various substitutions like **du veau, des**

gâteaux-secs, etc. Whenever the substitution word was not yet familiar to the class, he supplied the meaning in English quickly and parenthetically before using the word. At this point X also introduced the rules for the partitive article which he discussed briefly contrasting English and French usage. At the end of the hour, he passed out a list entitled "Vocabulaire Supplementaire" which contained all the vocabulary items introduced in the drill, with their English meanings.

6. The next lesson started with 20 minutes of lab activity. The laboratory work consisted in exactly the same pattern drill which had been taken up during the preceding class session. During the last 30 minutes of the lesson teacher X reviewed the unit for the impending quiz. The review consisted in additional recitation of the dialogue, pattern drills, and some so-called directed dialogue ("Ask your neighbor whether he is hungry"). There were also some translation drills in which X asked individuals to give the French equivalent of sentences like, **I want to eat bread.** or **Charles is drinking milk.**

7. The quiz covering the unit consisted, first of all, in two separate lines of the dialogue for which the students had to write down the corresponding response. Next, the students were asked to turn sentences like **J'ai faim** and **Je veux du rosbif** into the plural. In the final part of the quiz the students had to provide the French equivalents of **Charles is drinking beer; I am eating veal; We have cookies.** X corrected the quiz, counted the grammatical mistakes made by each student, and put the results on a "curve"—2 mistakes (the best score) to 4 was an A, 4 to 6 mistakes a B, etc.

Teacher Y: 1. Teacher Y started the unit by playing the first part of the conversation on the tape recorder in the classroom. After about two minutes she stopped the tape recorder, asked the pupils whether they understood. They said that they did not. Miss Y told them that she had not expected them to understand. She said that they had been listening to the kind of conversation that one might hear in a French restaurant. By the end of the week, the class would have no trouble understanding this conversation. As a matter of fact they would be able to engage in a conversation of that type themselves and they would know how to order a meal in a French restaurant.

Next Miss Y produced a paperbag, opened it, and took out her lunch (a ham and cheese sandwich) from which she took a bite in front of the class. **"Qu'est-ce que je fais?"** she asked and also gave the answer, **"Je mange. Pourquoi? Parce que j'ai faim."** Next she took the

thermos bottle which contained her coffee, filled a paper cup with coffee, took some swallows: **"Qu'est-ce que je fais? Je bois. Je bois du café. Pourquoi? Parce que j'ai soif."** The next step consisted in instructing the students that upon her question, **"Qu'est-ce que je fais?"** they would have to tell her **"Vous mangez"** and **"Vous buvez."** etc.

After a brief conversational exchange (during which Miss Y ate half of her lunch), the remnants of her ham sandwich were subjected to further grammatical analysis. **"Qu'est-ce qu'il y a dans le sandwich? Du fromage et du jambon. Je mange du fromage et du jambon."** Then she rinsed the paper cup in the drinking fountain (located in the hall immediately across from the classroom) and filled it with water: **"Qu'est-ce qu il y a dans la tasse? Il y a de l'eau."** Miss Y took a sip, **"Je bois le l'eau. Qu'est-ce que je fais?"** Some students supplied the answer, **"Vous buvez de l'eau."**

At this point Miss Y provided a brief grammatical explanation concerning the use of the partitive and the use of **"avoir soif"** and **"avoir faim"** and the bell rang.

2. The next classroom session was partly devoted to review of a previous lesson. After the review, Miss Y put a large picture chart in front of the class. The chart showed various dishes **(des pommes de terre, du rosbif,** etc.) and had obviously been assembled by cutting out pictures and ads from magazines like **Good Housekeeping** or **The Woman's Day.** About 10 minutes were spent learning the names of various items. **"Qu'est-ce que c'est? Ce sont des gâteaux. Qu'est-ce que c'est? C'est un rôti de veau. C'est du rosbif,** etc." The question and answer practice served quite obviously not only the purpose of learning the vocabulary but also as a drill for the partitive article. The **Qu'est-ce que c'est** kind of questions were interrupted by other types: **Quand est-ce que l'on mange du rosbif? On mange du rosbif pour le dîner,** or **Vous buvez du café? Quand est-ce que l'on boit du café? On boit du café pour le petit déjeuner.**

3. The next class sessions started with Miss Y producing different kinds of visual aids from a brown paper bag: not her own lunch but a box of cookies (cost: 25¢), some paper Dixie cups (30¢), and her thermos (filled not with coffee for her own lunch but with "Kool Aid"). The cookies and the Kool Aid were "used up" in pattern drill: **Qu'est-ce que vous faites? Je mange des gâteaux-secs. Pourquoi? Parce que j'ai faim. Qu'est-ce que vous faites. Je bois de la limonade. Pourquoi? Parce que j'ai soif. Votre voisin, que fait-il? Il boit de la limonade,** etc.

The second half of the hour was taken up with pretending to be

in a French restaurant. Miss Y set the stage: **"Voici un restaurant,"** she explained, pointing to the front of the class. **"Voilà une table libre"** (her own table in front of the room) and pointing to herself, **"Voici le garçon."** (See dialogue above). Two boys from the front row were chosen to be the first guests. They simply got the instruction to pretend to be in the restaurant and to order a meal, the best they knew how. They did not do well, but they did get across the general idea that they wanted vegetables, meat and potatoes, etc. Before the next two "guests" were invited to come up to the front of the room, Miss Y pointed out that perhaps the best way of getting service would be to ask for a menu **(Garçon, apportez-moi la carte, s'il vous plaît).** One of the "guests" started the conversation by asking for the menu as instructed. Imagine his disappointment and the amused reaction on the part of the class when the waiter (Miss Y) told him, **"The menu isn't ready yet."** (See dialogue above). So, the poor boy had to fall back on having to order his meal without the help of a printed menu.

4. In the next class session several pairs of students were asked to act out the restaurant scene. They were free to change the lines if they wished to do so (but only few of them did). They had to order at least one meat course, two vegetables, and a dessert, but the choice of what to order was not left to the "actors." Miss Y brought along four stacks of cards, one each for **hors d'oeuvres, viandes, légumes, desserts.** On each card was a picture (again cut out of a magazine) of a meat dish, vegetable, etc. (Note: The objects depicted on the pictures corresponded to the ones mentioned in Mr. X's "Vocabulaire Supplementaire.") The pupils acting out the conversation drew cards from each stack and had to hold up the picture and supply the corresponding expressions in the phrases which they were using (e.g., **Nous avons—des côtelettes de veau et du jambon . . . et comme légumes il y a . . . des carottes et des haricots,** etc.) On quite a few occasions pupils did not remember the names of the vocabulary items for which they drew the cards — some drew cards which showed dishes, the names of which had not yet been introduced. In the former case the class supplied the names, in the latter Miss Y herself "helped out" by telling the pupil (and the class) the French name of the objects shown on the card.

In the second half of the hour the same picture cards were utilized again in pattern drill exercises. Miss Y simply distributed the cards in the class so that each pupil received at least one meat course, one vegetable, and one dessert. Then she asked the pupils to answer the questions: **Qu'est-ce que vous mangez? Votre voisin, que mange-t-il?**

etc., according to the cards which they had received. After the cards had been distributed and redistributed several times for the purpose of repeating the same type of drill, pupils were asked to exchange cards among each other by asking each other for the food items represented on the cards (**Donnez-moi du café, s'il vous plaît; Passez-moi des pommes de terre!**) At the end of the class session Miss Y collected the cards. As each pupil handed his cards to Miss Y, he had to describe what he was doing: **Je vous passe des pommes de terre, du rosbif,** etc.

5. The next class session was spent entirely in the laboratory. Miss Y explained later that she realized that a 45 minute lab session was perhaps too long and that she knew that the experts and various studies had shown that the ideal lab period lasted only 20 minutes. However, the laboratory was located at the end of the corridor. Moving pupils to the lab during the class session was time consuming and interrupted the progress of her lesson. Besides, she explained, as far as the length of the lab session is concerned, "It's not how long you make it, it's how you make it long." At any rate, during the lab session the pupils listened, finally, to the basic conversation. As Miss Y had promised they had no particular problem understanding it. Listening to the conversation was followed by drill exercises (the same drills utilized by teacher X). The next part of the lab session consisted in questions which — as was announced on the tape — had been prepared by Miss Y especially to show the pupils that they could now understand a conversation dealing with going to a restaurant, ordering meals, etc. The questions were of the type: **D'habitude, qu'est-ce que vous mangez comme dessert? Qu'est-ce que l'on prend pour le petit déjeuner,** etc.

6. The unit quiz given in the lab during the next class session consisted of the following: The pupils listened to two short French conversations which could have taken place in a restaurant. Each conversation was followed by four statements about the conversation— to be marked true or false according to whether or not they referred to the conversation. Part 2 of the exam consisted of two short conversational exchanges between A and B. In each exchange A and B had about three lines — but the lines for B were left blank and the students had to supply them.

A: Apportez-moi la carte, s'il vous plaît.

B. .....

A: Alors, quelle sorte de hors-d'oeuvres y a-t-il?

B. .....

A: Et qu'est-ce qu'il y a comme plat de viande?

B. .....

The last part of the exam consisted of 5 questions (of the type practiced in the previous lab session), the answers to which the student had to record. Since the laboratory had only 10 recording stations, pupils took their turn in groups of 10 to take this part of the exam.

After correcting the exam, Miss Y had all pupils rewrite corrected versions of their answers on Part 2. On Part 3 of the exam the student received specific comments concerning their pronunciation, fluency, etc. On the exam as a whole the student received either a grade of pass or fail. Especially good exams were evaluated as pass with A in parenthesis: Pass (A!). Three students in the class did receive a grade of fail. The standard for passing was well known to the students and had been quite frequently explained by Miss Y. Pass means that the student comprehended at least 65% of what was being said — and that a Frenchman could understand what the student was talking about.

Both Mr. X and Miss Y were part of a group of teachers who took part in an experiment in which the pupil attitudes toward foreign language study was measured at the beginning and toward the end of the school year.[4] The attitudes of Miss Y's pupils improved but those of Mr. X's pupils deteriorated quite markedly during the year. Obviously it will take further research with large groups of teachers to determine just what qualities of the teaching of Miss Y were responsible for improving her pupils' attitude and motivation in the foreign language class — and just which of Mr. X's procedures tended to stifle students' enthusiasm and interest. Yet, on the basis of some of the known facts and literature concerning motivation, we can advance some hypotheses concerning the essential differences between the teaching procedures used by X and Y.

1. Mr. X used no strategy whatsoever designed to arouse the pupils' interest.[5] The anticipation in English of the conversation to be memorized and the same anticipation of the meaning of every new vocabulary item contributed, no doubt, to make the

subsequent introduction of the French material dull and uninteresting. Why pay attention to something we know already? Miss Y tried her best to introduce materials in such a way that the pupil's curiosity about what was being said and how it was said would be aroused.

2. Mr. X paid no attention to what might be the pupils' interest and how the pupil may perceive his own need to study French.* It is perfectly true that the "need" may, in fact, be satisfaction of parental desire or a language requirement. But it is also reasonable to assume that, once in a language class, most individuals feel that the only possible **real** need that they may have for knowing the language might be a situation in which they could use the language as a tool for communication. Miss Y attempted in her lesson to approach a real communication situation; Mr. X didn't even try.

3. Miss Y was very careful to insist that communication in French was the goal of the lesson. She stated this goal clearly at the beginning and adjusted her grading system and testing to the goal.*

4. Mr. X never made the goal of the lesson very clear to the pupils, but as far as can be judged from the conduct of the lesson, the goal was the mastery of a grammatical point, not the ability to communicate in the language. The positioning of the grammatical explanation toward the end of the lesson, the types of exercises which consisted of grammatical manipulation for its own sake, the quiz in which grammatical mistakes were counted — all of this points to grammatical correctness as the real aim.

Grammatical correctness is indeed a worthy and important aim, but as teachers and linguists we must ask ourselves: Is it the aim of our students? Someone defined a linguist as a person who doesn't care about **what** is being said but who is interested only in **how** something is being said. This concern with **how** instead of **what** is characteristic of the linguistic approach to language, but linguists are, after all, a minority. The vast majority of people care almost exclusively about the **what** and almost never about the **how.**

In a nut shell, this seems to be the essential difference between Mr. X and Miss Y. Mr. X's teaching implied that a point of grammatical correctness could be of major importance to his pupils, that they would

be willing to undergo a great deal of drill and repetitive types of exercises to achieve this grammatical correctness. The point of linguistic contrast between English and French became the focal point of his lesson. The "how" of the linguist drowned out the "what"— which is the normal concern and goal of the use of language. Miss Y made the linguist's "how" subservient to the "what" — and in so doing she truly managed to "apply" linguistics to the teaching situation.

1—See Robert L. Politzer, "The Impact of Linguistics on Language Teaching: Past, Present, Future," MLJ, L LVIII (1964), 146-151.

2—Robert L. Politzer, "Linguistics and the Elementary Language Course," MLJ XXXV (1951), 314-318.

3—E. R. Hilgard and D. H. Russell, "Motivation in School-learning," **Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education,** IL, Part 1 (1950), p. 67.

4—"An Exploratory Study of the Relations of Teacher Competence and Performance to Pupil Attitudes Toward Foreign Language Learning," **Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Research Memorandum No. 13,** Oct. 1967.

5—An arousal strategy is designed to "activate the learner, to focus his attention, to stimulate his curiosity" (see Frederick J. McDonald, **Educational Psychology,** 2nd ed., 1965, p. 144).

6—The alternative or complement to an arousal strategy is indeed that the teacher "provide material that he knows will interest the learner" (c. f. McDonald, **loc. cit.**).

7—For a discussion of the importance of goal seeking and the importance of the pupil's knowledge of goals see Hilgard and Russell, **op. cit.,** pp. 67 ff.

Discussion of Professor Politzer's Presentation

Patricia O'Connor
Brown University

Mr. Politzer has reminded us of two matters of concern to language teachers and language learners — concern with the learning of the language skills themselves, and concern with the real function of language, communication. The vast majority of human beings have much higher motivation to acquire proficiency to act in a social situation, than to acquire grammatical command of the language structure itself: for most of our students it is much more important to learn, for instance, to buy gasoline, than to learn to use the dative plural correctly. We know, of course, that there is no incompatability between control of skills and proficiency in social situations — we know, in fact, that this control is indispensable. What Professor Politzer has pointed out is that teachers with real interest in linguistic structures, and less interest in social behavior, may organize their courses as though their students had the same bias, with obvious sad results.

His Miss Y., re-enforced by an adequate diet throughout the school day, succeeded in keeping social utility in the foreground, while still providing a candid exposition of the function of structural control as support.

Any discussion of motivation must carefully specify the age, the overall educational goals of the learner, the availability of time, and the suitability of different teaching aids. Young learners need quite different kinds of rewards to maintain motivation. Mr. Politzer's example appears to be a judicious choice of what is today an "average" beginning language class — presuming that they are in the 8th or 9th school year. Obviously, Miss Y's presentation of the partitive, and the practice of idioms, would be out of place with 3rd grade youngsters; and the sandwich would be out of place with college freshmen. However the general principle remains: a situational focus can accommodate structural practice more easily, more palatably, than can a structural focus evoke an appropriate situation.

I would like to emphasize two aspects of motivation implicit in Mr. Politzer's discussion. One is that success, as opposed to failure, or taking pleasure in progress, is an obvious factor in students' motivation. One of the goals of linguistic studies as applied to language teaching is the sequencing of materials and kinds of practice so as to maximize the probabilities of success, and minimize the probabilities of frustrating unproductive practice — particularly during the early stages of language learning. Another factor, and one that is particularly important with younger beginners, involves the learner's need for, or dependence upon, an informed response to his efforts. I understand that some of the more sophisticated teaching machines are programmed to respond to certain mistakes with a warm — at least as warm as a machine can muster — chuckle, and a remark such as "Come now, you can do better than that!" But even this mechanistic response presupposes a precise knowledge of where the problem spots — the conflict points — are, and this, in turn, involves the contribution of contrastive linguistics.

But of course these contributions of linguistics are, and should be, underground, as far as any given language lesson is concerned. Very few foundations are, in themselves, lovely things, or very appealing. Necessary as they are as supports, they should be kept in the background, under wraps, as it were. What Mr. Politzer is asking for is more of the art that conceals art, or, to the extent that linguistics is a science, the art that conceals science.

Discussion of Professor Politzer's Presentation

Edward D. Allen
Ohio State University

The central idea in Dr. Politzer's very fine paper is that students learn a foreign language if they feel there is a reason for them to do so. This is the true source of motivation.

Time and time again I have visited classes where the teacher performed and the students either watched or "tuned out" on the performance. Unless the students feel they are continually involved in the learning process, they sink into blissful or painful apathy.

In order to involve our students we must be sure we are communicating with them. The word "cognition" is on the tongue of educators today. Cognitive objectives vary from simple recall to the solving of some intellectual task. To engage in problem solving, the students are asked to reorder given material and combine it with ideas and procedures previously learned. The meanings of words and structures need to be internalized and the interrelationships between elements in a sentence must be understood. If children have only a fuzzy notion of the meaning of: "Il faut que j'aille chercher un livre à la bibliothèque," or "Ven y te lo presento," there is a danger that communication is cut off.

How do we assure that true communication is present? Giving an exact translation or even a quick and parenthetical English equivalent for a sentence is not the answer. This is what Mr. X did, and we know the consequences.

First: the importance of visuals cannot be overemphasized. Mr. X had no visuals at all. Miss Y, on the other hand, had cut out many pictures from magazines. In my opinion, the companies producing the best visuals today are Chilton, Encyclopedia Britannica, and Heath de Rochemont. They are culturally sound, clear, colorful, attractive, and interesting.

Second: acting out the ideas and asking the children to do the same helps fix the concept. Asking pupils to go to the door, open it, and close it, may seem too much like Gouin, but it certainly helps internalize the thought. Miss Y ate her lunch in front of the class. One wonders if she did this in each of her other five classes — it would be a real contribution to language learning, but real bad for her waistline.

Props and visuals are very effective, but they must grow out of the lesson you are teaching. It is possible to pull out so many gimmicks that the kids enjoy the spectacle but aren't learning anything.

Miss Y had so many vegetables, meats, and dessert dishes to teach that her menu was slightly reminiscent of the so-called "laundry list" method. Perhaps she should have sacrificed some of the vocabulary and concentrated a little more on the correct structures.

Third: recombining, readapting, slightly shifting from the original basic sentences to similar ones. Last semester I taught **Voix et Images de France** in a beginning ninth grade class. So long as we described the pictures and the children memorized the basic sentences forming a dialogue, all went smoothly. As soon as I asked questions that altered the responses somewhat, even if it were only one slot, conflict ensued. By constant repetition of the readapted, recombined sentences accompanied by visuals and kinesics, cognition occurs.

Fourth: involving the students. If you teach the word "work," ask each student where his dad works. Give the model sentence: "M. Allen travaille à Ohio State University. Où est-ce que M. Jones travaille?" If one of the characters in a dialogue eats at six o'clock, ask each member of the class when he eats dinner. Similarly ask each one when he gets up, arrives at school, etc.

Fifth: gradation. The use of English is not necessary if small segments are taught, proceeding from the simple to the complex. To use Dr. Politzer's favorite analogy of the building blocks, we need to start with the simplest building blocks and progress to the more complex. Many of today's dialogues use sentences that are long and complicated. Students have only a vague notion of what they are saying. One of my seniors at OSU said to me the other day, "I had four years of Spanish in high school via an audio-lingual approach and I don't know a thing. In my fourth year I could mimic a gorgeous Spanish sentence but didn't know a thing I was saying." This was true of her

first dialogue as well as her last. You don't start with Proust or Cervantes; you start with the simplest elements of the language.

Sixth: generalizations. Perhaps the one place where I would disagree mildly with Dr. Politzer is his implication that waiting till the end of the lesson to give the grammatical explanation is undesirable. This is what Mr. X did. In the first place I don't think the teacher should give a grammatical explanation. I think the students should do this with the guidance of the teacher. Unless the class is involved in formulating its own rules, the risk of lack of communication is great.

For example, the teacher presents basic sentences, dialogues, and drills using nouns as direct objects which are changed to pronoun objects. The generalization might go like this:

Look at the underlined words in Column A.

Column A	Column B
Il regarde **le livre.**	Il **le** regarde.
Il regarde **le garçon.**	Il **le** regarde.
Il regarde **le jardin.**	Il **le** regarde.
Il regarde **le professeur.**	Il **le** regarde.

What do the underlined words in Column A have in common? The words underlined are objects. What word replaces them in Column B? The answer is "le." Where does the "le" appear in the sentences in Column B? Answer: Before the action word.

Many teachers teach their students all the correct sentences all the time. The result is boredom, especially on the part of the good students. There should be a time when the students are allowed to make an educated guess, to figure things out by association or inference. This kind of activity sparks much interest. For example, if I give the class, **Elle est grande/Il est grand, elle est petite/Il est petit,** then I let them guess at the formation of the next item. **Elle est intelligente,** ..... . It's not fool proof, of course. Just the other day I said, **Elle est sage,** and they came back in chorus with, **Il est sa.** But at least they were applying a principle, so I am pleased to see that some thinking was taking place.

I would like to refer you to an excellent article in this month's **NEA Journal.** It is called **"Motivating Students to Learn."** by Professor

Jack Frymier. He is not a foreign language teacher, but the points he makes about motivation in general certainly apply to foreign language teaching. One of his concerns is that we do not individualize instruction. I have a hunch that we foreign language teachers are more guilty on this count than any others. The lockstep approach is widespread and foreign language teachers say, "Keep up or get out." The language lab or electronic classroom is a good place to start individualization, especially if your lab has more than one channel. It has always struck me as a curious phenomenon that three or four children are permitted to sit in the back of the room and vegetate. When asked about this, teachers explain that these students are failing and there is no other place to send them.

I had a student-teacher who took an interest in one of these rejects and discovered he was fascinated by automobiles and mechanics. He gave him a copy of **Popular Mechanics** in French and the boy was amazed and delighted to find how much he could understand. Believe it or not, this boy passed French as a result of this experience.

An area that has been grossly neglected is the homework assignment. Most teachers do not provide interesting, challenging work outside of class. Typical assignments are: "Copy the dialogue five times and hand it in tomorrow;" or, "Read the fourth paragraph ten times."

One of my colleagues in an English class observed his student-teacher giving a composition assignment. She was so uninspiring that none of the students did it. Her supervisor then made her do this assignment, and she had to confess that it was deadly dull.

The next day she came in and read an essay on her pet parakeet. The kids were greatly amused and interested. When she got home that afternoon, a group of her students were waiting for her there to see the bird. The next day, all the kids came in with essays on their pets or their friends' pets. One under-achiever brought in a notebook in which he had taken notes on his observations of an alley cat; his opus was called "Diary of an Alley Cat." This was the first time since he had entered school that he had gotten any recognition for his writing efforts.

In conclusion, I would emphasize the fact that students are unmotivated when they don't know where the lesson is going or what is the point of dialogue or pattern drill. When we get this across to them, we are well on the way to solving the matter of motivation.

WORKS AND DAYS: Motivation, Language Learning, and the Profession*

Otis H. Green
University of Pennsylvania

President, Modern Language Association of America

I have taken my title from Hesiod, and not without reason. First of all, it seems to me to be suggestive of the laborious efforts — works — which the officers and staff of the Modern Language Association of America engage in throughout their days (and Heaven knows how many nights) as they further the interests of you who teach — or who in one way or another have a professional interest in — the modern languages and literatures. The **works** of the MLA, though they assume multitudinous forms, are directed toward a single aim: the bringing forth and the perpetuation of excellent performance by the practitioners of our profession; the providing of leadership and vision on the part of the central organization; the discovery of new visions on the part of you who work in the various fields — from experimental phonetics to the problems of learning, and from there to the entire superstructure of graduate study: critical editions, problems of aesthetics, theory of literature, and all the rest. What the MLA strives to achieve is the focusing of both visions (those of the MLA as an organization, and of yourselves as field workers) into programs of action which shall bear fruit in classrooms, in laboratories, and in the lists of our best publishing houses, of which the MLA itself is assuredly one.

Vision, multiple vision, converted into action on a plane of excellence. This is a sobering program. It is possible because we are a large organization endowed with power.

Now the word **power** has acquired in the recent past, and retains in the dangerous but hopeful present, certain sinister overtones. But

*This chapter was the luncheon address on Friday, February 23, 1968.

let us not think of power as a necessary evil. Everything depends on the control of power and — for the present certainly — the power I speak of is controlled by good hands.

It seems to me that a bit of history — the history of our Association — is in order here. In our case, owing to the past and present vision and competence of our leaders, plus the added power which our fast-growing membership has enabled them to wield on the national scene, we have evolved from an organization that stood in danger of seeing itself dry up at the edges like a pond, into an organzation that each day exerts power for the good of this nation.

As an introduction to this historical review I might as well offer a personal confession, which will help to make clear my own evolution into an enthusiastic organization man — as far as the MLA is concerned.

More years ago than I care to remember, I was consulted by the then General Secretary of the Association as to the advisability of splitting the Discussion Group known as Spanish III (Modern Spanish and Hispanic American Literature combined) into Spanish III (restricted to Peninsular literature in the modern period) and Spanish IV (Hispanic American literature). I was one of the few persons who voted for conservatism and the status quo. My argumentation ran as follows: even in the unified group as then constituted, the papers seemed often thin and inconsequential and it was difficult to organize a strong program. Therefore, the split proposed, I argued, would produce two groups where only one had grown before, and would inevitably water down the quality of the two new programs.

I was answered by William Riley Parker, then Secretary of the Association, that the purpose of the Association was not merely to read scholarly papers for our mutual instruction, edification, and emulation, but also to solve problems by means of communication between scholars; in other words, by seriously talking shop. So the new group was added; its programs and activities have shown that William Riley Parker was right.

Parker had in mind problems other than those exclusively concerned with research. He had become convinced that our whole profession would dry up unless the best brains of our membership widened their concern, identifying themselves with language teaching and language learning as activities bound up with the national interest.

He initiated and waged successfully his campaigns in Washington and in the offices of the great foundations, and by reason of the cogency of his presentations and the excellence of his performance he was able to reverse the dangerous trends. Our vast Modern Language Program — a program primarily of teaching in the secondary schools — was launched and successfully completed, with Federal and foundation aid. FLES, which as you know is the acronym for Foreign Languages in the Elementary Schools, was also launched, and chalked up its own victories.

Then Parker left us, and was succeeded by the equally effective George Winchester Stone (do not forget the suggestion of a fine rifleman implied by his middle name). The work went forward, and modern language teachers ceased to fear for the future of their profession, ceased completely to suffer from a lack of direction and leadership. The MLA itself became, more than ever, a power in the land. In fact, the growth assumed such beanstalk-like proportions that many have been dismayed, and some have even raised the question: Should not the MLA, like the old Standard Oil Company, be in some way broken up, divided, reduced to tractability? We shall revert to that question later in this talk. The one concession that has been made to this problem of bigness is the separation of the English and the FL meetings in two different hotels — a separation regrettable but necessary.

After serving with great distinction as General Secretary for a reasonable number of years, Win Stone announced his intention to withdraw from the responsibilities of national leadership and to return to his professorship. To my dismay, I became a member of the committee that was to select his successor. This proved to be much easier than I had anticipated, inasmuch as we were able to entice once again into our service John Hurt Fisher, who had already served as Assistant Secretary, and as Treasurer, during the Parker administration. Fisher, lured after seven years from the quiet of his Bloomington campus, returned to the headquarters city, and the present phase of our evolution began.

My association with the central organization has been closest during the term of the present incumbent, John Hurt Fisher. Committee assignments have been various, trips to New York frequent, and, as a final responsibility, there was bestowed upon me the First Vice-Presidency for 1967 and, two months ago, the Presidency for the current year.

In 1966, for me at least, the waters of change began to run with a stronger current. I sat with the Executive Council at its December, 1966, meeting, and since the coming of 1967, it seems that I was constantly travelling to New York for what were in reality training sessions.

Under the present administration, the structure of the MLA has been drastically changed. The offices of the President and of the two Vice-Presidents have become not merely honors, but real working jobs. (My presence here this afternoon is proof.) And an impressive number of staff members have been given permanent positions of great responsibility and authority in the offices at 62 Fifth Avenue.

I cannot represent to you what this command-chart is like, but I must tell you that John Hurt Fisher has been inspired and lucky in his choice of subordinate officers. We now have a person whose main work is the national meeting, and she, Mrs. Annabelle Quick, works about ten years ahead — plans are now under way for the meeting of 1977.

We have in Kenneth Mildenberger the ideal person to take charge of the Foreign Language and English Programs — which are the pedagogical side of the MLA. His official title is Director of Programs, including the Educational Research Information Center for English and for Foreign Languages.

André Paquette gives professional skill to all the programs of testing, programs which have involved cooperation with the U. S. Office of Education and with the Educational Testing Service. His title is Assistant Secretary for Foreign Languages, Executive Secretary of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), and Co-ordinator of the Foreign Language Testing Program.

Michael Shugrue is the missionary charged with his own special mission, which embraces all matters having to do with instruction in English. His title is Assistant Secretary for English and Co-ordinator of the Association of Departments of English.

Stephen Mitchell has his Ph.D. in English, but his responsibility and concern is the entire program of computerizing our New York office and its operations, as well as looking into the future to see how the electronic revolution can improve our Association.

John Harmon is Director of Information Services, Manager of the Educational Research Information Center, and Director of Personnel.

The scholarly interests of our Association are represented by its Executive Secretary and by William H. Pell, Assistant Editor of **PMLA**, by Harrison Meserole, Association Bibliographer; and by William M. Gibson, Director of the Center for Editions of American Authors, now being financed by the Federal Endowment for the Humanities.

I cannot speak with sufficient praise of the way these staff members perform their duties. The eventual question will be, how can we ever find replacements for them when, as it must, the time for replacement shall come? I state simply that the selection of this personnel has been inspired. It is also worth stating that these various positions seem to be prototypes for entirely new types of careers for specialists in the modern languages.

Over against these staff members and their subordinates stand the Committeemen of the Association: These constitute the Editorial Committee; the Compilers of the Annual Bibliography (now being computerized); the Program Committee; the Committee on Research Activities; the New Variorum Shakespeare Committee; the Index Committee; and, finally, the Association's official delegates: to the American Council of Learned Societies; to the Council on International Exchange of Persons; to the U. S. Office of Education's National Advisory Committee for Exchange of Teachers; to the Library of Congress's National Union Catalogue of Manuscript Collections; to the same library's Committee on Phototyping Foreign Manuscripts; and to the Center for Applied Linguistics.

So vast an organization obviously needs cement to hold it together. This has been provided by establishing — with remarkable success — personal contact between all these persons, their fellow-workers, and their employers (so to speak) at the annual plenary sessions of **all** the committees, held once each year at 62 Fifth Avenue. The meetings last usually two and a half days. In accordance with well known procedures, the first meetings set the keynote; the various committees work out their problems in separate committee rooms, and report back to the Committee of the Whole. There are final summaries. In these meetings, large and small, and at the luncheons and dinners and cocktail parties that are provided for the committeemen, there is produced an awareness of being engaged in a common enterprise of

the greatest importance. Scholarship and pedagogy join hands; problems of graduate schools are related to those of the junior colleges and even the elementary schools. Mutual respect is inevitably a by-product, and the Association as a whole is immeasurably strengthened.

Strengthened . . . That is the word. Earlier in my talk I promised to revert to the problem of splitting — or rather of refusing to split — our Association into English and non-English divisions. Such a split would deprive the non-English specialists of much of the distinction that they enjoy from being allied with their English colleagues, among whom are an immense number of top-notch men and women, simply because the non-English group is so very numerous. A division or split would deprive the non-English group of the financial power that the present state of union provides. And all of us — English and non-English alike — would find it impossible to do the wise and useful things now being done by an Association that is powerful because it is large.

In concluding, let me cite just a few of the recently published teaching tools which our Association will place in your hands if you but extend them, with a little silver or perhaps even a dollar bill with which to cross the palm of the distributor, which is the MLA Materials Center, 62 Fifth Avenue. I suggest that you write for the brochure entitled **Modern Foreign Languages,** if they are your specialty; if it is **English,** that you ask for the brochure so called. You will be pleasantly surprised. I suggest also **Growth Through English,** published by the National Association for the Teaching of English (Reading, England), available through our Association; and the electrifying **English, Education, and the Electronic Revolution,** by Edmund J. Farrell.

Of more scholarly interest are three brochures put out in the last two years: William Moulton's **A Linguistic Guide to Language Learning; The Relations of Literary Study,** edited by James Thorpe; and **The Little Magazine and Contemporary Literature,** which I guarantee will shock you wide awake. Of somewhat older standing, are four essays edited by James Thorpe under the title **The Aims and Methods of Scholarship in Modern Languages and Literatures,** namely: "Linguistics" by William Moulton; "Textual Criticism" by Fredson Bowers; "Literary History" by Robert Spiller; and "Literary Criticism" by Northrop Frye.

And certainly you should not forget, if you are not already using it, the **MLA Style Sheet** and the Report of the Association's Committee

on Trends in Education, readapted by Howard Lowry with the title "Literature in American Education," published as an editorial in the December, 1950, issue of **PMLA.** This last, in my opinion, provides the best ammunition of all for when you are called upon to defend literary study, under any circumstances whatsoever.

As if the humanities needed our defense! Of course, they don't, because they are immortal; and yet they **do,** for the simple reason that times change, and change brings thoughts of panaceas, and panaceas can be mighty tempting — temporarily.

Having offered you, in this brief talk, such a dazzling array of wealth to be had — almost — for the asking, I would give one item more, as a departing gift. It is a simple definition of what serious literature is, of why literary study must have a place in our curricula. It was written by a Spaniard of the late nineteenth century whose figure has been almost, but not quite, erased by ungrateful Time. His name was Silverio Lanza, and this is what he said: "It may be that the things I write turn out to be novels; but my only concern is to dedicate myself to writing letters to God, informing Him of what goes on on this planet."

Motivation In Language Learning: The Teacher

Stowell C. Goding
University of Massachusetts

If each one of us would look into his heart and conscience and the past history of his joining our profession, I am quite certain that he would look back to the influence of an inspiring teacher. I can well recall a series of high school teachers in my early study of French who can only remind me of one of the answers to a questionnaire sent recently to a number of institutions inquiring, among other things, as to whether they had practice teaching in their teacher training. One answer I shall never forget. It went something like this, "We do not have practice teaching because in our small town there is only one French teacher and nobody could profit by working with her." On the other hand, as a freshman in college, a sympathetic, understanding, and friendly teacher started me on a career of a French major and later teaching.

In preparation for this paper, I reviewed some of the professional literature on motivation, particularly as it applies to the teacher. My most constant reaction was a phrase which we older people heard a great deal during the last war, "Is this trip necessary?" "Trip," of course, being spelled with an "E." Some important studies which I consulted, for example, seemed to imply that the teacher had no part at all in the motivation of the student. Only the student was considered. Such factors as psychological health, achievement values, non-scholastic task orientation, socio-economic status, adult identification, parent attitudes toward child rearing, sex, and achievement, were considered to be the important factors in motivation. I would be the very first to agree that all of these factors have their importance and within the limit of possibilities should be known to the teacher to aid in understanding the students in his classroom and in working with them. In fact, as we face this revolting generation (you may take "revolting" whichever way you wish), the products of our affluent or effluent society, I am **not** making a plea for the unperceptive and under-

educated teacher. I was shocked to read recently in a respected newspaper of national circulation a letter which stated in part, "I believe that it is good for teachers in some towns and counties not to have degrees. I have lived around and worked around several Ph.D. people. It is my belief that they are fine in the national bureau of standards and head of university departments, but out in the rough, open country of Texas, California, and many states, just a person with some knowledge and lots of common sense gets better results."[1] Such attitudes take me back to my early youth when I heard a hill-town farmer say to the new elementary school teacher, "I suppose you have to teach that the earth is round but you and I know 'tain't so." The same respected newspaper recently thundered against the I.Q. test, editorializing in part, "It has been found that when children, who have actually done rather poorly on I.Q. tests, are placed in special classes under teachers who have been given to believe that the children were especially gifted, the latter showed a swift and remarkable rise in scholastic progress. What we find particularly encouraging in this is that, clearly, the teacher's attitude toward her pupils was the most important element. Believing them endowed with unusual intelligence, seeing them as able and gifted, she acted in line with her conviction and the result was gratifying and heartening."[2] While I do not believe that many of us would be "dupes" in such a situation, I would like to stress the word "attitude" and the difference it made. To put it most crudely, I often say to my teacher trainees, "If you don't love your subject, love to teach, and love to work with young people, even delinquents, find some other occupation."

Motivation has been defined as an energy change within the person, characterized by effective arousal and anticipatory goal reactions. The energy change is the prerequisite to the effective arousal. This arousal may be characterized as an emotion, a feeling state accompanying motivated behavior.[3] In other words, persuasive communications has influenced attitudinal responses. Another word is **persuasion.** As one psychologist puts it, "Persuasion is one of the most elemental of the human arts. It charges men for battle, it stirs political waters, it brings men to churches and synagogues and drives them to ridicule the same institutions. The Greeks had a name for it—rhetoric; we have many names for it — oratory, advertising, preaching, and teaching."[4]

To me, what we are talking about here are personality traits. While some of the arts of persuasion and communication can surely be taught, studied, and made more effective, personality is perhaps

something which has quite jelled by the time we become teachers. I am reminded of the shocked silence which followed the remarks of a former president of Harvard University at an opening convocation of the Graduate School of Education. He said, "Any fool knows that teachers are born, not made."

However, not only should we give much thought to the qualities of personality before launching a prospective teacher on a career, but more research needs to be done into those factors of personality which are most effective in good teaching. I would certainly agree with Wallace Lambert who wrote ". . . Language teachers and their trainers could profit from a careful study of current research in the psychology of personality. This area of specialization offers various means of selecting those who would be most effective as language teachers, a matter as important as it is neglected in educational research."[3] Of course, there has been some research on personality and the motivated teacher and such research is still going on. For example, one researcher reports, ". . . warm and considerate teachers got an unusual amount of original poetry and art from their high school students."[4] Another investigator found that ". . . the utilization of intrinsic motivation by the teacher and the teacher's personal warmth were highly correlated; this would seem to justify some emphasis on warmth of personality in the selection of teachers who are to be trained to make use of pupils' intrinsic motivation."[5]

At this point, I would like to confess that my personal simplistic research has not been too fruitful. Last year I administered a personality inventory to a group of teacher trainees. Some 16 personality traits which were supposed to characterize the integrated personality of the effective teacher were inventoried. Later, I took the evaluations of the inventory with me into the field, observing the practice teachers on the job. I could find no very good correlation between the profiles and the performances of the teachers.

Be all this as it may, what positive steps can we as teachers take to enhance the motivation of our students? I would like to suggest several specific studies which we could all fruitfully undertake for this purpose. The first of these would be some knowledge of what is called "group dynamics," the art of working with groups, whether large or small, in our classes, in our department meetings, in our contacts with such groups as administrators, school committees, PTA's.

If you will permit, I would like to relate a personal experience

which is not without its relationship to the question we are discussing. Back in 1959 and 1960 when NDEA was new and the very first institutes were created, I had the privilege of directing a year-long institute for secondary school teachers of French. Since I had the only French institute, I asked myself what justified the rather large cost of the subsidy of a group of teachers for an entire academic year. My thought was that since the position of state supervisor of foreign languages was very new, and a part of the National Defense Education Act, I would take the top five or six participants, and, as I naively put it then, "groom them for leadership," meaning the new position of state supervisor. After that year, two of the selected group did become state consultants and the others went on to distinguished careers. After the experience of directing three summer NDEA institutes, one in the United States and two in France, and after some research into the question of leadership training, I decided to incorporate in my NDEA institute in France last summer a component which would in part train not leadership, but the potential for leadership. The immediate spur to my decision was a statement at a recent Northeast Conference that among the many teachers in our profession, there were a goodly number highly qualified for the rapidly multiplying positions of city system foreign language coordinators, county supervisors, department heads, and other positions of leadership. To this I reacted strongly. I knew that there had already been a few highly successful institutes for persons already in positions of leadership. Last summer, our work in leadership training was under the very capable direction of Professor Frederick D. Eddy of the University of Colorado. In our selection process for admission to the institute, Professor Eddy and I found, quite naturally, I think, that the majority of applicants modestly stated that they were interested in the "second level" overseas training in depth, but were not specifically interested in the training for leadership. However, a few stated that they were interested only in our institute because of this very leadership challenge and training. In order to identify the "potential" for leadership, Professor Eddy devised an interesting test. Last spring each selectee received a communication which stated:

> A. **The situation.** Time: March, 1967. Place: Middletown, U.S.A., a small, prosperous city that prides itself on its schools and supports them well. You have been MFL Department head and teacher of French in Memorial Junior-Senior High School ince September, 1965. Other members of the Department (all friendly, effective, alert teachers) are:

Name	Language	Since	Especially strong in
Miss Banker	French	1940	College Board performance of pupils
Mr. Lehrer	German	1965	Audio-lingual performance of pupils
Mrs. Wills	Spanish	1955	Popularity with all pupils
Miss Gonzales	Spanish	1960	Audio-lingual performance of pupils

The Department has adequate equipment in several electronic classrooms and a small FL lab. Total MFL enrollment is approximately French 250, German 100, Spanish 200.

To date, all languages have been using more or less "traditional" texts, supplemented by a patchwork of commercial and home-made drills and tapes. Under your guidance, and after careful study, the Department has petitioned the Board of Education for funds to change over in September, 1967, to new materials for class and lab in all languages, published by the Horizon Book Co. The petition was approved by your principal, Mr. Beeson, and the city superintendent, Dr. Jessel. All Department members are eagerly awaiting a positive reply — except Miss Banker, who sees "no reason to change" and who took little or no part in the study, although she did not actively oppose it.

The Banker family has been a leader in city affairs for many years. Miss Banker's brother, a successful merchant, is president of the Board. You suspect a relationship between that last fact and the note from Mr. Beeson you have just received, at 3:00 p.m.:

> Regret to inform you, petition refused today. Reason given: too expensive. Another Board meeting tomorrow afternoon. Last chance to present alternative proposal— if you have one. If so, must have it before noon tomorrow.

It is impossible to call a Department meeting today, and to reach all members by phone tonight. You can get a memo

in their boxes to read and return with comment to you during the morning.

B. Your solution.

Write the two or three memoranda called for by this situation: those that you would write and deliver before noon tomorrow. Please put each memorandum on a separate page. Indicate on each who gets the original memo and who (if anyone) gets a carbon copy. If you would add any personal notes to individuals on either original or carbons, be sure to include them.

I am sure that you will agree that the so called test was not without its elements of reality. In fact, I might confess that only last December I was "hoist on my own petard." A large school district in a neighboring state asked me to head a small committee to evaluate their foreign language program and to make recommendations for improvement. The day went like this: In the morning we talked with the teachers, visited classes, investigated the entire program. During the afternoon with the state supervisor, a distinguished "teacher of the year," and a classics teacher, we conferred and drew up a series of recommendations. At the close of the day we were all invited to a banquet followed by my presentation of our findings and challenging questions, not from the one local school committee but from all four school committees of the regional district! I was constantly reminded of the terms of our leadership potential test and was always on my mettle to perform at least as well as our applicants had performed on paper.

I cannot here take your time in order to go into any extensive details of our program for the training of leadership potential. I would like to say that we started with a feature now characterizing the training of future leaders in other professions, too little in ours. I am referring to what is called "role playing" which dramatizes a situation and a problem faced by anyone who works with groups. We enlisted volunteers to play the roles of a group of teachers in a department meeting who "did it all wrong." We cast the indifferent teacher, the cynic, the "devil's advocate," and so forth. The results were hilarious as our audience reacted to all the familiar situations and personalities. The next day we had role playing of a positive kind: a group of teachers in a department meeting working harmoniously and arriving at concrete and fruitful, forward-looking ideas. It should be noted that our definition

of leadership never included the dominant personality, the dictator, but rather the type of personality and communication which elicits the best from all members of the group. Obviously, this applies as much to the teacher in the classroom as to the teacher working with colleagues and supervisors.

While I cannot relate the entire contents of our work in leadership training, I would like to indicate some of the results. At the outset, about 20 of our participants had indicated their positive interest in the program in leadership training. At the end of the summer, no fewer than 43 of them had indicated that they wished to continue their studies in this field and meet whatever challenges of leadership came their way.

Those of you who have participated in an intensive program of study and travel abroad would agree, I think, that when the plane departs from the foreign country for New York, it would be normal to revert to our native English and to think of almost anything except of the work of the preceding summer. However, our group continued to work and discuss our program all the way from Paris to New York, and did it with gaiety and even hilarity. To me, it was an amazing experience. Usually, the thought of arriving home, taking up our normal tasks, departing from newly made friends is more often a rather sad and silent experience.

If I may, I would like, for a moment, to digress to a question of the relationship of the psychological to the physiological. In common with other overseas institutes, my institute in France in the summers of 1964 and 1965 had undergone the rather appalling experience of what is commonly called "cultural shock." This is the problem of rapidly adapting to a different climate, nourishment, and more important, to new protocols, living in a new language and culture totally and intimately. One of the manifestations of cultural shock is extreme fatigue and a whole series of minor physical ailments, stomach upsets, headaches, sore throats resulting in absences from class for one or several days. My physician wife who accompanied us for the first program in 1964 thought that it had to do with a lack of American resistance to stronger microbes and a somewhat lower standard of sanitation. At any rate, from the point of view of the direction of the institute, these widespread ailments were a constant problem and annoyance. In 1965 we had the same experience even though our host **lycée climatique** does maintain a very high standard of sanitation. As we

planned the 1967 institute, we discussed at great length the question of the leadership training in English or in French. Previously, there had been no use of the native language whatsoever throughout the nine weeks of the program. On the grounds that the technical terminology was purely American, I reluctantly agreed that for the two hours per day, in large groups and small groups, the leadership training could take place in English, but strictly limited to specific times and places. To my amazement, one unexpected result of this partial "liberation of tongues" to a complete self-expression in the native language was that there were no physiological problems whatever. There were no minor ailments, no classes missed, in other words, no physiological results of cultural shock.

Since the return to America last August, I have carefully followed the careers to date of the participants, asking them to report continuously on evidences of leadership challenges accepted and of the effect on their present work of our training in group dynamics and other aspects of the training. I have been continually surprised and delighted, even at this early date, by the many evidences of increased activity and effectiveness. As a partial representation of all of this, I would like to quote portions of a letter recently received:

> The excellent leadership training that you provided has been indispensable to me in my present endeavor. Let me be more specific. Our council operates almost the same way as the leadership course in France. The council is subdivided into small groups to work on specific problems and/or subject areas. Needless to say, this has given me a great opportunity to apply the principles of group dynamics. We operate as a team. We have achieved outstanding results. It would require volumes to enumerate all the details of our activities.
>
> Frankly, I do not know what I would have done without the wonderful experience I received this summer. It certainly has instilled a higher degree of confidence, a sense of direction, a concept of priorities, and a constant awareness of the importance of each team member.

The second study which I would recommend is what is now known as "Interaction Analysis," the study of the actual classroom behavior of teachers in order to develop category systems, not to evaluate teaching but to describe it, the assumption being that before

you can evaluate the teaching act you ought to know what the act consists of. "Studies have been conducted to determine the teaching patterns used by teachers as they interact with pupils. Such studies have been done in elementary and secondary schools in classes of English, science, social studies, and mathematics. Foreign language has been almost totally forgotten in these studies, perhaps because of the need not only for researchers to understand systems for analyzing classroom interaction, but to understand foreign language and the peculiarities of the foreign language class as well."[8]

A recent experiment at Temple University with in-service teachers was reported as follows: To find out more about their teaching patterns, the teachers were asked to use the Flanders system to analyze a tape recording of themselves teaching a lesson prior to taking the course. From this analysis they decided for themselves what changes they would like to make in their teaching patterns. Each teacher was then asked to prepare a ten-minute micro-teaching lesson in which he was to teach live pupils. In teaching this lesson, the teachers were to try to produce behaviors which would match the "ideal" matrix they had planned for themselves. The lessons were videotaped, coded using the interaction systems, and played back.[9]

The results of this experiment are reported:

> Five weeks after the new school year began, a comprehensive questionnaire was sent to the participants to find out whether the course content had influenced their classroom teaching. The data clearly indicated that the teachers found studying observational systems had greatly influenced their perceptiveness and their interaction in a positive direction. The behavioral changes the teachers perceived themselves as having made were related to concepts in the systems which were studied.
>
> In general, teachers trained in interaction analysis become more indirect, accept more pupil ideas, and criticize less than teachers not so trained. Flanders found that teachers whose pupils had high achievement and positive attitudes also had these kinds of teaching patterns. It would seem, therefore, that training in interaction analysis is helping to produce teachers with appropriate teaching skills and that these changes are also possible in the foreign language classroom.[10]

If you are not already familiar with his publication, I would suggest that you risk the small sum of 50 cents and send to the U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402 for "Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes, and Achievement." This is a study in considerable depth reporting research and findings in teacher motivation and interaction analysis. I am quite attracted by one of the opening statements in this publication: "The first step toward systematic classroom management is made when a teacher understands how to control his verbal communication so that he can use his influence as a social force. Unfortunately, this kind of knowledge and the corresponding skill don't always go together. As one teacher put it, 'I know what I'm doing and I am usually aware of most mistakes that I make, but I don't know what to do about it.' "[1]

Finally, I would like to mention some research now going on at Stanford University and the University of Massachusetts under Dwight D. Allen on what is called "motivation set" or "set induction." These are studies of the activities which take place at the beginning of any given class hour which motivate the students to a better performance during that hour. A request for "Technical Skills of Teaching" to the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts will bring a report of findings to date, although the research is far from completed.

In conclusion, permit me to say that, like yourselves, the highly motivated teacher is a professionally dedicated teacher, one who attends and participates in conferences like this, who belongs to and is active in professional organizations, and who, above all, reads their journals. Speaking of journals, I trust that everyone of you here present is a member of ACTFL and has already received the first two issues of the **Annals** and noted their highly professional and valuable contents. I am reminded of the spirit of our group in France last summer. One of our participants rose during one of our sessions and proposed that everyone of the 54 teachers take an oath to join ACTFL, not sometime in the future, but then and there. Membership blanks were secured and it did take place. And speaking of oaths, I proposed that a true profession has a code of ethics, subscribes to it and believes in it. For this reason, while in France, I did a little research on the French version of the Hippocratic Oath taken by all doctors before being licensed to practice their profession. In cooperation with one of my staff, who was an **agregé de grammaire** and a doctor of the community, we worked out a **Serment des Professeurs de français** which was beautifully multicopied and presented, along with the diploma of the institute, at our graduation ceremony. It concludes,

"Si je remplis ce serment sans l'enfreindre, qu'il me soit donné de jouir heureusement de la vie et de ma profession, honoré à jamais parmi les hommes. Si je le viole et que je me parjure, puissé-je avoir un sort contraire."

1—The Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 15, 1968, p. 16.
2—Ibid., Jan. 11, 1968, p. 16.
3—Frederick J. McDonald, **Educational Psychology**, 2nd Ed. (Belmont, California, Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1965), p. 112.
4—Ibid., p. 342.
5—Work paper prepared for Seminar on Language Teaching, University of Washington, summer 1962, pp. 1, 2.
6—Morris L. Cogan, **The Behaviour of Teachers and the Productive Behaviour of their Pupils**, Journal of Experimental Education, xxvii (Dec., 1958) p. 89-124.
7—Horace B. Reed, **Implications for Secondary Education of Teacher Competence Research**, Sci. Educ., xlvi (Dec., 1962) p. 473-86.
8—An abstract prepared for the annual MLA Conference on Teacher Preparation, Chicago, December, 1967, p. 1.
9—Ibid., p. 3.
10—Ibid., p. 3.
11—Flanders, N. A., **Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes and Achievement**, DHEW, Office of Education, Coop. Research Project No. 397, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1960, p. 1.

Discussion of Professor Goding's Presentation

George W. Ayer
University of Texas
(Austin)

In line with Professor Goding's comments on culture shock is the story by Cornelia Otis Skinner about her trip to France — **le grand tour** — with her friend Emily Kimbrough. The girls wanted to save a half-full bottle of wine and needed to ask the waiter for a cork. After long discussion they came up with this sentence:

"Je veux un chapeau pour la bouteille. (I want a hat for the bottle.)" Mrs. Skinner said, "Ten years of French went into that sentence." I hope that our students will be able to do better.

Professor Goding has commented on the mass of existing professional literature relating to motivation, and the inapplicability of some of the more highly technical concepts. He has warned us, appropriately, that we are not likely — as teachers — to achieve change in our own personalities. He dwells upon the importance of favorable attitudes held by the teacher toward the student and reminds us that Professor Lambert begs teachers and teacher trainers to consider research in the psychology of personality. I don't want to go into technical considerations of psychological research. I merely want to mention some results of that research that would be good for teachers to know about, because they enable the teacher to **understand the learner better.**

We all deal with adolescent learners, give or take a few years, but how well do we really know them? Do we know their hopes and their fears? Do we study them so that we can understand them, so that we can help them work and learn better? In the last issue of the **TESOL** newsletter Kenneth Croft tells about a culture test in which he got some surprising answers. To the question, "With what famous American do you associate the name 'Poor Richard'?" one of the students answered "Mr. Nixon."

We know our students are unpredictable. We can't tell what they're going to answer, or how they are going to react, but the psychologists often can. We teachers should take account of some of the things they find out. For instance, there are these common fears caused by schoolwork:

(1) fear of teachers;

(2) fear of examinations;

(3) fear of talking before the class.

The unusual relevance of these findings to the language classroom is evident. Our classes are necessarily dominated by the teacher (he knows the language and the students don't), the students have to talk, and they cannot do it privately. We give them frequent tests and examinations. All of language teaching in the audio-lingual sense then, touches on areas that are emotionally sensitive in adolescent learners; if we know this we can adapt our procedures accordingly.

If we know the adolescents as the psychologists know them, we know that they are impatient of drill or monotony; they want variety and excitement; work involving drill must, therefore, always be directed toward some purpose that the adolescent wishes to achieve — these are not the words of a language teacher, but of a psychologist. But how clear is the message to us to whom drill is an important teaching activity? The psychologist knows that you can't motivate adolescents like you do children. Children will work to earn a visual approval symbol — a gold star — or to please the teacher, or obediently in response to authority. The adolescent can no longer be controlled by mere authority. He wants to follow his interests, and it is the teacher's business to know these interests and to capitalize on them.

Speaking of students' interests, and how to get them involved in their work, how to get them, as they would say, "turned on," the psychologists remind us that the work of the student does not have to be **easy** in order to be satisfying. In fact, easy work is not likely to challenge him or to fulfill his needs for idealization, and easy work will not let him conceive of himself convincingly as a competent controller of his own environment. A small or petty task does not earn his respect. A large or difficult task will, if the teenager is motivated to undertake it (and if it is of reasonable scope; the teacher can guide in discouraging the student from undertaking tasks beyond his ability). We know how much effort students will apply to foreign

language learning activities such as clubs, dramatizations, writing letters or diaries in the foreign language, writing reports, if the subject of the activity is of interest to them. These students advance quickly and the teacher acts as their consultant or advisor. They display a sort of "intrinsic motivation" which is to say, a motivation intrinsic to the study of the language itself. The teacher who develops this motivation is successful.

We are now concentrating our attention on the interests of the students as a key factor in motivation, and I wish to think about student interest in relation to three factors: (1) student activities; (2) teaching materials; and (3) methodology.

Student Activities

The number of things that can be done in a language classroom to advance learning in addition to reading a textbook is almost infinite. The major obstacle to most teachers is time to prepare the materials necessary for varied learning experiences.

However, I wonder how many of us are fully aware of how many activities are available to us, many with no preparation at all. A recent book describes 25 classroom language drills, including listening drills, speaking drills, reading drills, and writing drills.

The same book describes 34 language learning games which likewise cover the skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing, the majority being drills for speaking. Couldn't most of us profit from some new kinds of exercises, new games, some new drills, some new types of tests? I'm sure we could and we would find a heightened motivation, particularly among adolescents, to whom variety is so important.

The book I mentioned which has the games and the drills is a relatively recent book by William Mackey, called **Language Teaching, An Analysis** (the title is really a misnomer; the book is a veritable encyclopedia of theory and practice for the language teacher, being over 500 pages long with a 1700 item bibliography).

Teaching Materials and Student Interest

The adolescent psychologists who know what our students **are** like, know also what they **do** like. They could help us plan our programs — our curricula — to include a maximum of "motivational potential," that is, to be as interesting as possible to the student.

What concerns me is not the nature of the basic course, the basic audio-lingual materials; I see little hope of making these self-motivating; there has to be a heavy component of repetitive donkey work if the student is going to learn the basics; the motivation must come from elsewhere (the teacher, not the materials themselves).

What concerns me is the reading material, where the teacher has a choice, and sometimes chooses without regard for student interest.

Professor Elton Hocking in a recent address to the Foreign Language Association of Northern California, devoted much attention to an analysis of the excessive premature concentration on literature in high school classes. He sees the situation as one against which the profession should rebel, saying, "Today there is an urgent need for a revolution against this domination of our high school teaching by the colleges and the graduate schools." The student entering college, says Hocking, "faces literature — or else." The idea of college preparation, together with the Advanced Placement Program, which moves the college survey of literature right down into the high school, is responsible for tailoring high school programs in a way that takes no account of high school students nor of their capabilities or interests. Hocking thinks that this excessive attention to literature is responsible for the high drop-out rate — two-thirds in two years, nine-tenths in three years — of foreign language students.

My colleague Katherine Wheatley used to proclaim dramatically, "There are three great master works in Spanish prose: **La Celestina, Don Quijote,** and (pause) **Noche Oscura en Lima.**" The humor in the anecdote lies in grouping an artificially written textbook story, **Dark Night in Lima,** with two of the authentic classics of Spanish literature. However, for the emotionally or linguistically unprepared student, I would have no doubt that **Noche Oscura en Lima** is more interesting than the great classics. Language teachers are prone to pick reading material according to a standard of literary values that is irrelevant for the average student. If we are careful, we can find readings of acceptable quality that are high in student interest; if we are in doubt, the overriding factor in selecting reading materials should be student interest, not literary quality.

Methodology

Audio-lingual methodology is going through hard times now. There is a reaction against the theories of the structural linguist about language as habit. The idea of language as a "closed system;" the rigid

nature of memorized materials, which allow the learner to function linguistically only within the conditions established by the drills from which he learned; the difficulties involved in proper use of the language laboratory: all these gravitate against the current fashion.

But whatever the ebb and flow of linguistic theory, psychological fashion, or methodological innovation, the students will learn if they are properly motivated.

Let me finish with a general comment about the importance of motivation to the learning of foreign languages. There are in this room about 800 people who are teachers of foreign languages. All of us are here because of motivation. Somebody or something at some time ignited in us the spark of desire to learn a foreign language and to learn it well enough to want to teach it to others. The whole purpose of this Conference is to think about that spark and about the ways to make it glow in more students. I am primarily interested in the student. The teacher is a worthy soul; we are all worthy souls. But let's remember the student, the learner, and think of him as the most important person to our profession. The learner is what it's all about. Because, we don't teach really; we just help learn. And if we can make the student want to learn, he's made a big step in the right direction. And that's what motivation is all about.

Question to Professor Ayer:

"Do you really believe that linguistic acquisitions will automatically insure interest in the classics, as you say, 'later on'?

"Isn't additional motivation essential? (Do you have a specific suggestion?) Speakers of English don't necessarily automatically 'like' to study English classics."

Answer:

No, of course the pure linguistic ability does not insure that anybody will appreciate or enjoy the classics, in any literature. We do know that they will not read the classics if they drop out of the foreign language class, and we don't want to cause them to drop out of the foreign language class because they are being subjected unwillingly to classics that they do not understand or do not like. Our colleagues in English have given us the example of how to kill student interest when they assign **Silas Marner** instead of Salinger, Shakespeare instead of Steinbeck.

Discussion of Professor Goding's Presentation

Jacques Hardré
University of North Carolina
(Chapel Hill)

Professor Goding has given us much food for thought. I would like to underline nine points which seem to me the most important in his paper, bearing in mind that my assignment is to relate Professor Goding's pronouncements to the practical application in the classroom.

The first has to do with practice teaching during the teacher-training period. Since I happen to be head of a large university department, I am naturally keenly aware of the great advantages that practice teaching can offer to our graduate students who, immersed as they are in their studies, have little or no time to devote to the study of a vitally important part of their training, i.e., the methods and strategy of teaching. When I was a boy in Greensboro, North Carolina, I attended classes in a school attached to what was then the Woman's College and is now UNC-G. Our teachers, from the elementary grades through high school, received as student-teachers college majors in the various disciplines, to whom—after a period of indoctrination—they turned over the class for regular periods during each semester. How often have I wished that every university would have such a school at its disposal, where the majors could receive guidance and could have classes to teach under the supervision of experienced teachers. As it is now in most universities, only the majors in education are able to include a period of practice teaching during their senior year. The graduate students, most of whom have not had any contact with educational theory or practice, have perforce to learn their trade on the spot — often to the detriment of their students! That we achieve as good results as we do never ceases to amaze me! We have this semester 96 graduate instructors teaching the majority of the French and Spanish elementary courses. Many of these have had previous experience in teaching, either at the University or in some other institution. Those who started their teaching with us are required to take a brief indoctrination course at the start of the semester. It is a valuable

course, but hardly sufficient. The remedy is obvious: require a methods course and practice teaching during the first year of graduate work under close and constant supervision. Unfortunately, this requires financial support and extra staff, neither of which seems easy to acquire these days.

Professor Goding stated that he was started in his career as a French teacher because of the sympathy, understanding, and friendship of a teacher. How many examples of the influence of the teacher could be cited! This is indeed the most rewarding part of our profession. What greater pleasure can one have than to see a student so impressed by one's attitude, knowledge, and enthusiasm that he decides to pursue the same career. How often have I marveled at finding in my class a young lad from some isolated hamlet of North Carolina fired up with enthusiasm for the French language, literature, and culture and, upon asking him why, receiving the response: "My high school teacher gave me that enthusiasm."

The above observations naturally lead to the third statement in Professor Goding's paper which I have noted. To his teacher-trainees, he says: "If you don't love your subject, and love to teach, and love to work with young people, find another occupation." The triple use of the verb **to love** is significant in this statement. Indeed, a love for one's subject is, I would say, of prime importance. I have never known a great teacher who did not love his subject; and I have known many teachers who, though deficient in other aspects, yet, because of their obvious love for their subject, still managed to do a competent job in the classroom.

The next five statements that I have underlined in Professor Goding's presentation have to do with the research and experimentation being carried on today. If it is correct that "teachers are born, not made," it is so only up to a point. Just as when we speak of a "born actor" (and the analogy here is chosen for obvious reasons), we recognize that certain people have inherent traits that facilitate their behavior on the stage — but we realize that these traits have to be recognized, nurtured, and disciplined before any greatness can be achieved. And so Professor Goding is justified in saying that "more research needs to be done into those factors of personality which are most effective in language teaching." He cites Wallace Lambert's statement: "This area of specialization (research in the psychology of personality) offers various means of selecting those who would be most effective as language teachers."

I have no quarrel with these statements and I am very much interested in the type of research which Professor Goding recommends, such as "interaction analysis" and those being conducted at Temple, Stanford, and Massachusetts. The results of these experiments should be of benefit to us all.

However, as much as I agree with the theory, I am forced here—perhaps acting as the devil's advocate — to ask how these theories can be applied in practice. Again as a department chairman, my concern is with time, space, and mony. For example, it would indeed be of immeasurable help to me if I could, through research on the psychology of personality, be able to learn how to select those graduate students who come to us who would be most effective as language teachers. But by then it is somewhat late. They have already spent much time, effort, and their parents' money to major in French or Spanish in their undergraduate days. This selection should have been done therefore at an earlier stage, say, when the student decides to major, i.e., in the sophomore or junior year. But by whom and through what means will this selection be done? Obviously there would have to be a staff member in each department whose training would enable him to discern "those factors of personality which are most effective in good teaching." How many language teachers are there — or how many can we prepare — who would at the same time be fluent enough in a foreign language and with knowledge enough in the literature and culture to warrant an appointment in a foreign language department — and yet also be conversant enough with the psychology of personality to fulfill the function in question? Can we be sure enough of the validity of our research in this area to be convinced of the sureness of our judgment? But more important, are we rich enough in candidates for foreign language teaching to afford the luxury of discouraging sophomores or juniors from embarking on the career?

These are questions which occurred to me on reading that part of Professor Goding's statement. It seems to me that given our circumstances and our needs, the most valuable research we can pursue is rather in the areas which Professor Goding cited under the title of "interaction analysis." Furthermore, I would say that not only do we need this research, but more importantly we need to do research on how to apply the results of these studies in our present educational system. Those of us who are faced with the practical application of ideas are justifiably concerned with what I suppose can be called the "art of the possible" and the possible is unfortunately quite often extremely limited.

In closing, may I state my perfect agreement with Professor Goding's final commentary: that "the highly motivated teacher is a professionally dedicated teacher who attends and participates in conferences like this, who belongs to and is active in professional organizations, and who, above all, reads their journals." And, taking my cue from Professor Goding, may I urge all of you to join your respective AAT's — and to read **Hispania** and the **French Review.**

Testing and Motivation

Rebecca M. Valette
Boston College

For centuries, testing has been equated with horse-whip motivation: "You had better do well on this exam or else . . ." And the threats vary from duncecap to paternal disapproval to refusal of admittance to the desired school. Try as we might, we will never totally eradicate this negative motivation inherent in testing. Moreover, we must admit that a few students thrive under such conditions.

But let us devote our time this morning to a consideration of the positive motivational factors of testing. What are the vulnerable spots in our current instructional system and what remedies can testing suggest?

The real problem facing our profession, and a problem which most of us prefer to circumvent, is the following: many a Johnny in our classes is **not** learning that foreign language. After one or two years of French he can recite a few dialogues, much as his parents can still verb paradigms. Of course, some of his classmates have acquired competence in French through audio-lingual methods, but then some people (including a good percentage of those now teaching foreign languages) learned a second language through "traditional" methods.

We know why Johnny **should** be learning a foreign language: all of the practical and national-interest reasons plus, in my opinion, the most compelling reason, that he may become increasingly aware of the phenomenon of language, for when we think only in terms of our own language we cannot readily conceive of other ways of thinking and other ways of cataloguing experience.

We all know, too, that he **can** learn a foreign language, especially if he begins soon enough. The correlation between IQ and performance in language class is not high. Aptitude tests are useful in

diagnosing problem areas and in grouping more homogeneous classes, but they should never be used to prevent students from studying a foreign language, for we have not been able to define, much less measure, "language aptitude" with complete confidence. Motivation and attitude, as Dr. Wallace Lambert pointed out, are also important factors which influence second-language acquisition.

If all students should and can master a foreign language, why is it that so many don't?

In 1963, Paul Pimsleur, Donald Sundland, and Ruth McIntyre investigated the problem of underachievement in foreign language learning at the secondary level. In the course of their comprehensive study, they found that, in comparison with English, mathematics, history, and science, foreign languages were much more sequential, i.e., future learning was more dependent on previous learning. Of all students who received an A, B, or C in their first year of French or Spanish, close to 60% received a lower grade the second year. This means that over half the students who earned a C the first year received a D or an F the next year. One third of the first-year D students failed the second-year course and the others did not tend to improve their grade.

That foreign languages are different from other academic subjects in the curriculum is a fact that parents, teachers, and administrators must be brought to realize. In its initial stages, language learning is a cumulative process, much like learning to play the piano. The piano student learns first some basic hand positions and the rudiments of musical notation. If he has not yet learned to play a melody in octaves with two hands, his teacher does not give him pieces with more difficult left-hand accompaniment. Rather the student must continue practicing simple pieces and master them before being introduced to somewhat more demanding ones. At the end of a certain period of study, which varies from individual to individual, the student may be said to have "mastered" the fundamentals of piano playing: he can perform works he has memorized and he can sight-read music of moderate difficulty (even though his first rendition might be but a rough imitation of the actual piece). He has reached a **plateau.** He is far from being an accomplished pianist, but he has acquired a sufficient foundation upon which to develop his skills in a variety of directions. He would do better to continue under the tutelage of a piano teacher, but he knows enough to make progress on his own if there is no teacher available.

In language learning (to draw upon Simon Belasco's concept), there exists a similar **plateau.** Once the student has mastered the sound system, the basic structures, and the most frequent morpho-phonemic changes of the language, and has acquired a fundamental working vocabulary of roughly 1,000 words, he has reached this plateau. He can understand the foreign language when it is clearly enunciated and he can use the language to ask for necessary clarifications and to express his ideas. He is not a fluent bilingual, but he can now continue to perfect his mastery of the new language (i.e., to build his vocabulary, to increase his level of reading comprehension, to learn to understand more rapid speech on a wider variety of topics) either with the guidance of a teacher or on his own. We might say that when Johnny does attain this plateau, he has "learned" a foreign language. (In operational terms, Johnny has completely assimilated the material presented in the first two years, or levels, of a high school audio-lingual course; the language is no longer a strange code to be interpreted but a means of communication.)

Let us now rephrase our original question: Why do so many children who take foreign languages fail to reach this plateau?

The answer is the basically foreign languages are still taught just the way they were fifty years ago, in lock-step classes where proficiency is equated with years of study. When Unit One has been "covered," that is, when the material it contains has been mastered by a certain percentage of the students (usually just those who get an A on the unit test), Unit Two is begun by the entire class. Now, it is obvious to all those who are familiar with musical notation, that, if a child is still mixing up half notes, quarter notes and eighth notes, the teacher does not introduce dotted halves and triplets. But in the language classroom, the equivalent practice is current. In observing the usual French class, we discover that those students who cannot yet handle direct object pronouns with confidence are presented with sentences in which the past participle must agree with such pronouns; and, more often than not, many of those students are still having difficulty with the formation of the compound past tense. The A students manage and the rest gradually fall by the wayside. For the majority, motivation slumps.

But there is a solution to this problem of declining motivation, a simple logical solution but one which does not fit the traditional patterns of our schools. From the time a student begins the study of a foreign language, until he reaches the plateau, his performance should

be rated uniquely on a pass/fail basis with a score of 90-95% as the cutoff point on each unit test. Total mastery of a unit is the requisite for continuing the next unit. Obviously some students are able to reach the plateau much more rapidly than others. Classroom procedures will have to be modified: we can envisage either groups of students working on different units or students working on individualized materials within the same unit. It is my hope that we can develop an instructional program which will permit the implementation of the second alternative.

Let us not overlook the fact that foreign language instruction has improved substantially over the past decade under the influence of new techniques. I believe that the most substantial contribution of the audio-lingual method has been its emphasis on the formation of correct language habits and the consequent reduction of the amount of material presented in a given period of time. For example, **A-LM French: Level One**, which high school students usually "cover" in one year, introduces about 500 words plus the present tense of the regular and some irregular verbs, the **passé composé** of verbs conjugated with **avoir**, the articles and adjectives (including possessives and demonstratives), expressions of quantity, and the subject and object pronouns. "Traditional" first-year language texts brought in at least twice as many vocabulary items and included almost all the grammatical features of the language (the future tense, the imperfect, the conditional, plus the subjunctive forms, not to mention demonstrative pronouns, relative clauses, and much more). The "traditional" second-year course consisted of a review grammar because students had not mastered the contents of the elementary course; the third-year class used a different review grammar for the same reason. The audio-lingual method, on the other hand, postulates the total mastery of a restricted amount of material. However, the effectiveness of the audio-lingual method is being critically undermined because progress from unit to unit is currently being determined on a class rather than an individual basis. (Moreover, total mastery of an audio-lingual unit is not the mere memorization of a dialog, but complete control of all the structure and vocabulary contained in that dialog or unit no matter under what form — written or spoken — or in what context it is presented.)

The implementation of the "total mastery concept" by the addition of a series of pass/fail unit tests would significantly increase the motivation of the students and the effectiveness of current teaching materials. As new materials are developed and present ones revised, provision must be made for comprehensive unit-mastery tests and more

individualized units designed to introduce variety and stimulate motivation. Language in its complexity does not lend itself to an entirely programmed presentation. Communication requires people, and the language class must provide for group activities. We might predict that the foreign language programs of the future will be built around a set of core units which would be mastered by everyone and form the basis of classroom communication exercises. Competency in listening comprehension, manipulation of spoken patterns, reading, and writing would be developed by means of self-instructional modules, thus permitting students to advance at their own rate.

The optimum time to begin foreign-language instruction is in elementary school. In the second or third grade, full-class instruction can be effective (just as some schools sponsor group piano lessons at that age). But gradually, as more material is presented, a system of unit-mastery tests must be initiated. On the average, the child who begins foreign-language study in an integrated program at the age of seven or eight should reach the plateau in junior high school. The child who begins his study in the seventh grade will on the average require three or four consecutive years of study. The student who starts a foreign language in the ninth or tenth grade will need two or three years of study. Colleges which demand foreign languages for entrance should specify the plateau as the minimum requirement and, if appropriate, specify a given number of years of study beyond the plateau level. Until the plateau is reached, grades reveal nothing. (For piano lessons we do not usually assign grades because they would only reflect attitude or assiduity, not performance.) Progress in basic foreign language courses can only be effectively evaluated on a step-by-step pass/fail basis.

All students can learn a foreign language, although some will take much more time to attain the plateau than others. Our current system unjustly penalizes all those children who are learning less rapidly than the A students. As the former flounder in the growing complexities of the code they are expected to master, they perpetuate the myth of the "psychological language block." It must be our task to eradicate that myth and in so doing we will discover the power of positive motivation.

Discussion of Professor Valette's Presentation

Anne Slack
Modern Language Project

My assignment is to discuss Professor Valette's paper as it applies to FLES. However, before discussing "Testing and Motivation" in FLES, I believe it is pertinent to raise a very fundamental question: Do **we** really have a foreign language program in the elementary schools of our nation? Do we have a "national" FLES program, as we indeed have a language arts program, a science program, a math program, a physical education program, a music program, etc., etc.?

I'll tell you why, among other reasons, I feel this question needs to be asked . . . once more:

Last Spring the Department of Elementary School Principals of the NEA held its annual convention in Boston. It lasted five full days and was attended by thousands of educators and administrators from every state of the union. The theme was "Directions in Elementary Education," and there were section meetings and discussions on **all** subjects pertaining to the elementary school curriculum . . . all subjects except foreign languages. There were also "information centers" on every subject, open a few hours daily, and here, somehow, FLES managed to sneak in! Some of us in the Boston area were invited to serve as FLES consultants in those centers but, since foreign languages did not appear on the program and therefore "did not count," we only had a handful of "customers." Most of these customers were administrators who happened, by sheer accident, to see the sign "Foreign Languages" in our corner, and who stopped by, mainly to rave about their own FLES programs, the majority of which seemed to be devised by local teachers using a "salade" of courses, old and new, to which they added their own seasoning!

Permit me to remind again that this **national** convention of elementary school principles on the subject of "Directions in Elementary Education" took place in April **1967**, some fourteen years after the first MLA-FLES Guides were published, fourteen years, during which we

thought we were making our place in the sun. This little story certainly does not make us feel that FLES is recognized by the very people who run the elementary schools of our country as a subject worth their consideration and concern. Could it be that FLES is still so shaky, that our goals are still so nebulous, that we haven't been able to agree within the profession, let alone convince "outsiders," that foreign languages do indeed belong in the elementary school? I'll let you answer this question for yourselves.

I would like to say a few words now about FLES achievement tests. Most publishers of leading FLES courses supply tests built around the content of these courses. In the case of **Parlons Français**, we provide at every level standarized tests with national norms based on samplings of 1500 students in the U.S. and Canada. However, according to my own observations, a large number of FLES tests are still devised at the local level, and many are so unsophisticated, so naive, that they prove absolutely nothing.

As to a national FLES achievement test, there is none at this date and, considering the many unpredictable interpretations of FLES, one might rightly ask of what use a national test could possibly be! On the other hand, I am afraid we won't have an **honest** "national" FLES program, until some way is devised to measure student achievement in a particular school system and compare it to the national norm. I am afraid I have come to the point where I feel that it is only by this kind of shock-treatment that we shall eventually do away with the "laundry list" programs which have managed to survive so long.

I sincerely believe that a standardized test with national norms would at least be a way to:

1) upgrade weak programs,

2) support strong programs,

3) convince laymen and administrators who control the expenditure of **money** and **time** invested in a FLES program that they are receiving adequate dividend for their investment.

It seems to me that if we, as a united profession, could finally agree on what FLES should "be" and "do" and communicate our findings to educators, administrators, and textbook publishers, it would be comparatively easy to devise national achievement tests. These

could be so organized as to reflect the methods and contents of the leading foreign language courses in the elementary school, as do, for example, the **Pimsleur Proficiency Tests** for the junior and senior high school foreign language programs.

Some years ago, a large percentage of educators and FLES practitioners were opposed to the idea of extensive use of standardized tests, for fear that the battle cry would change from "Teach the language" to "Teach for the test." Actually the two goals are not mutually exclusive. Donald Walsh said in 1963 (Hispania):

> "We believe firmly that testing is a legitimate and necessary extension of teaching and that the test-maker's goal must be to construct a test in such a way that students — and teachers — who are cramming for the test will be engaged in effective learning."

I shall come now to the specific discussion on "Testing and Motivation" as it applies — or could apply — to FLES.

There is no question that well-constructed tests or quizzes stimulate and challenge the young child, **as long as** he is asked to deal with vocabulary and structures with which he is familiar. One has only to spend a few minutes in a FLES class involved in a French test, for instance, to sense the concentration and excitement of these eager youngsters, to notice their smiles of delight and triumph when they realize they have avoided what was intended as a trap; one only has to hear some of their post-test comments to realize that they thoroughly enjoy the intellectual challenge. When **Parlons Français** students described some sections of our Year III test as "sneaky," we knew this was not a criticism, but an expression of approval: they approved of a test which kept them "on their toes," which acknowledged their abilities, their power of concentration and of deduction, a test that was not so easy as to prove nothing. Children are not easily fooled.

It was in working with young children in FLES classes, in devising more and more sensitive and "sneaky" tests for them, that it occurred to me that the word by André Gide: "Tout ce qui est difficile est beau," did not apply to adults only.

On the other hand, the young child who is confronted with material which he has not assimilated, who is submitted to tests where he knows he can't but fail, will become discouraged and naturally motivation will vanish.

It is therefore obvious that, in the elementary school as much as in the upper grades, as Professor Valette stated, "classroom procedures have to be modified to allow for groups of students working at different levels."

Since this is admittedly more easily said than done, except perhaps in the ungraded school, some people tend to solve the problem simply by making FLES classes increasingly selective. The selection is generally based on the child's intelligence, even though all research indicates that IQ is not a good predictor of performance in foreign languages.

Instead of eliminating the "low achiever" from FLES classes, it would be much more constructive — and realistic — to devise achievement tests that would include provision for "small step increment material" (John Carroll), for "comprehensive unit-mastery tests" (Valette), thus assuring the learner of successful and rewarding experiences in the foreign language.

It seems that, for the moment, at least in FLES, we are doing anything but that. Rather, we are penalizing the patient for taking the wrong medicine instead of making the physician realize his error and prescribe the right medicine.

Finally, I would like to bring to your attention the new aptitude tests, EMLAT, for Grades 3-6, advertised in the **Foreign Language Annals** of October 1967. The publicity for this test indicates that it consists of "four game-like parts that measure special learning abilities." It claims that the tests will help:

" - assess the readiness of pupils to learn a foreign language

- identify pupils with a special talent for language

- place pupils in fast or slow groups for language learning

- diagnose language learning difficulties "

It is obviously impossible to say now whether this kind of test can be helpful to FLES programs. Extensive experimentation will have to be conducted in various school systems and results carefully assessed. Equally important will be the evaluation of the test itself, since, as pointed out by Professor Valette, "aptitude tests should never be

used to prevent students from studying a foreign language, for we have not been able to define, much less measure, 'language aptitude' with complete confidence."

Another word of caution regarding aptitude tests for FLES: Valuable as they could be to place pupils in fast or slow groups, they could also easily be used against "FLES for all" by administrators and, sadly enough, by large numbers of language teachers who feel that foreign languages are only for the academically talented students.

It behooves us to re-examine our thinking and expectations about FLES and to come up with a clear definition of objectives and expected outcomes. In so doing we will be able to help Johnny become the proud "junior linguist" he would love to be, should be, and can be.

Motivation for the Study of Latin

John F. Latimer

Some years ago in a Baby Greek class there was a long-nosed gangling student, from Texas, as I recall. Since he was not very good I began to wonder why he was taking the course. One day I asked him. "I'm studying Greek," he said, "so I can look down my nose at the rest of the world."

His answer didn't surprise me much. He had a dry type of wit and a droll attitude toward life. His comments and questions kept us all amused and helped to make the class one of the most interesting I have ever taught. I have often wondered what happened to the student and whether his motivation, put into practice, brought him the pleasure he seemed to anticipate.

Although I did not mention it to him, he had actually indicated in jest an attitude of mind that many people in all seriousness once thought was characteristic of students and teachers of the classics. The feeling was generated early in American history and continued throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when Latin and Greek were the chief ingredients of education in nearly all schools and colleges. During this period many journals and periodicals carried a running debate between the advocates and opponents of ancient and modern literature. The proponents of ancient literature extolled its virtues as repositories of wisdom, truth, and beauty and eventually weakened their case by claiming too much. Their overpraise aroused great animosity among proponents of modern literature and occasionally made them subject to scornful attack as a "set of pretenders to knowledge, who always assume an unjust superiority from their acquaintance with ancient writings, . . ."[1]

From the arguments used in the debate it is easy to see the "reasons" students were told they should study the classics: to increase literary appreciation, to develop a pleasing literary style by imitating the best models, and to gain the satisfaction that comes from

reading Greek and Roman masterpieces in the original languages. As long as the secondary curriculum remained primarily classical and largely directed toward college entrance, the attainment of such objectives would provide motivation enough for most students. Knowledge of such objectives would also give rise to "snob appeal" and to the belief that the study of Latin and Greek was for the **elite** and not for the **ordinary** student — a belief that has persisted in some quarters to the present day.

But motivation was destined to take a different turn. As the country developed and the idea of **universal** education made headway, many academies and private schools sprang up to meet diverse and growing educational demands. In 1826 the system of public schools began which was to outstrip all other types by 1900. Although many if not most of these tended to include **practical** subjects and exclude Latin and Greek, in time they too became college-oriented and added those two subjects to their curricula.

By 1890 the increase of subjects in secondary schools was causing serious problems. Schools varied widely in their offerings and in length of class periods. As families moved and entered their children in different schools, lack of a common curriculum made transition difficult and delayed admission to college. In 1892 the National Education Association appointed a Committee of Ten to remedy the situation. Among its members were some of the most distinguished educators of the day: President Charles W. Eliot of Harvard, chairman, Woodrow Wilson, William C. Collar, Benjamin Ide Wheeler, George Lyman Kittredge, to name only a few. The Committee of Ten selected nine subcommittees of ten each to deal with the nine subject-matter fields into which the curriculum was divided. Each committee had secondary school and college or university teachers among its members.

The nine subject-matter fields were as follows: Latin, Greek, English, two modern languages (French and German), mathematics (arithmetic, algebra, plane and solid geometry, trigonometry), physical sciences (physics, chemistry, astronomy), natural history (biology, botany, zoology, physiology), social studies (history, civil government, political economy), geography (physical geography, geology, meteorology).

Each sub-report contained three common elements: a rationale for inclusion of its subjects in the curriculum, how those subjects re-

lated to subjects in related fields, and correlation of the subjects with studies in lower grades.

In drawing up a curriculum based on these twenty-three subjects, the Committee was undoubtedly influenced by two ideas that had long been held in educational circles: that it was the business of the schools to impart knowledge as a basis for good citizenship and to develop mental training by disciplinary drill. Latin, Greek, and mathematics were the three subjects traditionally considered best suited for accomplishing these purposes. In keeping with modern needs and developments, other subjects were added that would serve the same purpose.

> Throughout its report, however, the Committee stressed the values of mental discipline. In this they had the support of a new psychological theory developed between 1860 and 1890. According to this theory the mind was thought to be divided into several separate compartments, each of which controlled different faculties, such as judgment, will, memory, reason, imagination, and feelings. It was assumed that mastery of certain subjects trained the separate faculties and that the mental discipline thus acquired was 'transferred' for mastery of other subjects. Since this involved an educational process that was the same for all students, essentially the same type of curriculum was necessary for all.[8]

As a logical sequence to this belief the Committee, keeping the varied abilities and interests of children in mind, drew up four model curricula: Classical (Latin, Greek, and one modern language); Latin-Scientific (two foreign languages, one modern); Modern Languages (French and German); and English (one foreign language, ancient or modern). The four curricula would have in common English (4 years), mathematics (3 years), a foreign language (4 years), science (3 years: physics, chemistry, physical geography), and history (2 years).

The Committee agreed that there were other subjects that should be included in the curriculum: art, music, and physical education. In its opinion, however, these subjects could be arranged according to the personal inclination of individual students after the basic subjects had been scheduled.

The matter of motivation was of some concern to the Committee. It knew that objections to a curriculum primarily academic in content

would be raised, as indeed they were. Among these was the argument that such a curriculum would prove too difficult for the average student. The Committee, in anticipation of that point, admitted that the program would not be easy but felt that, presented in the right way, it would arouse the pupil's interest, appeal to his imagination, and develop his powers of observation and reason, which were greater than commonly supposed. To say, for example, that the average child could not learn the elements of mathematics and science was to assume as true something that had not really been tried. **The most powerful factor in all learning was motivation based on interest.** If the program did prove too difficult after it had been given a fair trial, teaching methods rather than the child's ability might be the cause. **Much would be demanded of the pupils: perhaps even more of the teachers.**

Motivation therefore was not simply and solely a pupil- or self-generated response to an educational opportunity. The initial desire to learn must be there, but the desire may be increased or decreased under the stimulus of competent or incompetent teaching. Home environment and school environment also play their indispensable parts.

These are some of the lessons that may be conned from the Committee of Ten's Report. They are commonplace now, but they were strong medicine at the turn of the century. Liberal doses of that medicine today would not cure all of our educational ills, but they might reduce the academic blood pressure.

The subjects recommended by the Committee still constitute the core of the secondary school curriculum. Its influence predominated through World War I and up to the beginning of the Great Depression. In that period a new philosophy of education came to the fore and continued strong until the early 1950s: the theory of life-adjustment. It seems to have been dormant in recent years, but it is by no means dead. Under this theory the purpose of education is not to train and develop the mind, but to create social and civic awareness and responsibility. Emphasis is shifted from the discipline of formalized training to cooperative problem solving, from subject matter to the student and his individualized needs.

Such a philosophy of education may not be altogether bad. It may permit the student to find his natural bent and accordingly motivate him to his best efforts. The danger is that such permissiveness may make it difficult if not impossible to establish any educational

standards or curriculum patterns. One's personal interests change quickly in adolescence and are not always safe guides for courses of study. Neglect of basic subjects at the wrong time can interrupt an important sequence and cause unfortunate delays in scholastic progress. A self-chosen curriculum based on misguided motives often results in failure and dropout that could have been prevented by firm insistence on certain basic requirements. More dropouts are probably caused by failure due to boredom than by failure due to lack of ability. Tailor-making a program that would fit the special talents of each child and challenge his best efforts would usher in an educational millennium, but such a prospect is indeed utopian. It need not detain us here.

What should detain us is one of the perennial ironies of every educational program, namely, the refusal of many students to study a subject in which, with competent instruction and proper motivation, they would do well and relish the opportunity. Fear based on a subject's reputed difficulty is of course a frequent reason. The sciences, mathematics, and foreign languages are the principal objects of such fear. On occasion a moral factor seems to enter the picture. This has apparently happened in the case of physics during the last few years. The effect on enrollment has been observed chiefly in secondary schools, but it is also noticeable in colleges. Chemistry has been affected too, but somewhat less than physics. The connection of these subjects with the development and perfection of nuclear devices is said to have caused the moral issue. Although mathematics is perhaps even more indispensable for nuclear developments, apparently its enrollments have not been affected too much by the conscience crisis. Higher mathematics, too, is a stage that most students never reach even in college, to say nothing of graduate school.

It is doubtful if moral considerations about the study of foreign languages, especially Latin and Greek, ever enter the student's mind. Two other factors are usually uppermost: the fear complex, already mentioned, and the prevalent notion of impracticability. A third factor must also be considered: the competition of other subjects which have strong claims as essential ingredients in a well-rounded program.

These three factors play some part in decisions which students in secondary schools must make in choice of subjects which are generally elective. Most colleges, for example, do not require any language for entrance, and those that do usually specify two years of any language.[3] Effective motivation to **begin** foreign language is a

problem that all languages face, but it is probably most serious for Latin in secondary schools. (Greek is so seldom taught at that level that it need not be considered. In many respects, however, what is said about Latin in this connection would be applicable also to Greek.)

Under the influence of the Committee of Ten's Report and the widely accepted theory of the transfer of training, Latin became one of the leading subjects in public high schools and remained the most popular language until 1949.[4] As early as 1920, however, it was becoming clear to many classicists that all was not well on the high school Latin front. In June of that year the American Classical League appointed a special committee to negotiate with the General Education Board about a plan to survey the status of Latin in the secondary schools. The negotiations were successful and the survey began in 1921. In 1924 **The Classical Investigation: Part One, General Report** was published by the Princeton University Press. (Page numbers given in parentheses refer to this **Report** unless otherwise indicated.)

At the beginning of its investigation the committee drew up a list of 21 aims and objectives under three general headings: instrumental and application, disciplinary, and cultural. To test their validity, questionnaires were sent to high school teachers and students of Latin, college freshmen who were continuing the study of Latin, and college graduates who had studied Latin in high school. In addition, all were asked why they had studied Latin.

Although the answers varied widely, they could be grouped under ten "statements" which could be considered indicative of the **motivation** for the study of Latin (78-79).

1. Increased ability to read and understand Latin
2. Increased understanding of those elements in English which are related to Latin
3. Increased ability to read, speak, and write English
4. Increased ability to learn other foreign languages
5. Development of correct mental habits
6. Development of an historical and cultural background
7. Development of right attitudes toward social situations

8. Development of literary appreciation
9. Elementary knowledge of the simpler general principles of language structure
10. Improvement of the literary quality of the pupil's written English

These aims and objectives represent the **values** stated by sufficiently large proportions of those questioned to make them significant. They represent the **ideal** toward which good teachers strive. They were published in the hope that parents and teachers might have a common basis on which to discuss the role of Latin in secondary education and that parents might be better able to advise their children about such study.

Among the students who answered, points 2, 3, 4, and 5 above occurred most frequently as the reason given for their study of Latin (73). Other reasons were: insistence of parents, necessary for graduation, special friends were taking Latin, expectation of teaching Latin, and Latin was easier than some other subjects (74).

One or more of these eight reasons then might be considered as motivation factors for many students. This is not to say that some students were not motivated by one or more of the other six "statements," but the eight just cited would probably occur most often.

The extent to which children are influenced by their teachers in the choice of subjects, particularly by those who teach the subject, is open to question. In one sense **The Classical Investigation** might be considered an attempt on the part of a professional organization to influence children, through their parents and teachers, to choose Latin as a subject for study in secondary schools. There is nothing wrong with such activities. The proponents of all disciplines, except possibly English, which is usually compulsory — and rightly so — do the same thing. The question is: How well do such attempts succeed? Is that the best way to influence parents and students? Wouldn't it be better to direct such propaganda at guidance and counsel personnel? Should the attempt be made at all?

These questions come down to a more fundamental consideration: What are the essential factors in motivation? In the opinion of this non-psychologist, they may be divided into two general types: personal and environmental.

What makes some students good musicians, good athletes, good mathematicians? In most cases it is a combination of innate ability and opportunity for development. In other cases it may be ability plus ambition to succeed. This could obviously work with any discipline. People tend to like what they can **do.** Some, by force of will, make themselves **do** something until they like it — for the satisfaction it brings? for the attainment of some goal? Who knows? Such motivation has even worked for learning Latin and Greek!

Plato had the common sense word about the environmental factor: if a state could not exist unless each citizen learned to play the flute to the best of his ability, flute-playing would be at a premium (**Protagoras** 327A-C). In modern terms this would be equivalent to saying, as Jerome Bruner did, that "increasing emphasis on technological progress and federal aid in the interest of coping with the competitive crisis that America must face as a world power" are likely to lead to what has been called a **meritocracy.** This occurs when "students are moved ahead and given further opportunities on the basis of their achievement, with position in later life increasingly and irreversibly determined by earlier school records."[8] At a time when it is determined, for example, that national welfare demands young men and women trained in science and mathematics, and preferential treatment is given in the form of federal aid and subsidies, but those gifted in the humanities are neglected — that is a meritocracy. Who can deny that such support is a powerful factor in the motivation of students?

In some respects, it has recently been maintained, "American education is essentially a reward system."[9] Children of average-income parents learn at an early age that they can win "prizes" by doing well in school — candy, money, a new dress, and the like, inducements which seldom come to children of the ghetto. An experiment with such tangible rewards for such children, reported in the article cited, has been extremely successful in motivating them to learn. The danger comes, as the authors point out, when the rewards are stopped. Will the sweet smell of success prove to be sufficient motivation for continued learning?

It may be that psychologists and sociologists are on the way to a scientific analysis of motivation in learning that will help to solve many educational problems for individual students. Until that millennium comes, teachers of Latin and Greek will have to rely on improved

teaching methods, revised curricula, discreet advertisement of cultural and disciplinary values, receptive parents and students, friendly colleagues,' and a climate more receptive to humanistic studies.

1—Quoted from the **Royal American Magazine** 1(1774) 126, in an article by the writer, **"America's Battle of the Books, Part I,"** in **The Classical World** 45 (November 1951) 3.

2—See p. 65 of the writer's book, **What's Happened to Our High Schools?** (Public Affairs Press, 1958). This section of the paper is largely adapted or quoted from Chapter v of this book. The **Report of the Committee of Ten On Secondary School Subjects** was published by the American Book Company in 1894.

3—For the latest and most complete information about this matter, see **Foreign Language Entrance and Degree Requirements in U. S. Colleges and Universities,** Fall 1966. Modern Language Association of America, December 1966.

4—See **Biennial Survey of Education 1948-50,** Chapter v: "Offerings and Enrollments In High-School Subjects 1948-49." Published by the United States Office of Education, Washington, D. C. in 1951. Table 7 gives the "number and percentage of pupils enrolled in certain subjects in the last 4 years of public secondary day schools, 1889-90 to 1948-49." It is a **capsule** history of the high school curriculum for the years indicated. It lists three subjects in the field of English, 11 in the field of social studies, eight in the field of science, four in the field of mathematics, seven in foreign languages, and 13 in vocational subjects. In addition it lists industrial subjects (not given separately), home economics, agriculture, physical education, music, art, and teacher training. It shows the first year when enrollment figures were collected on each of the 53 subjects listed and therefore the approximate year they entered the curriculum.

5—See Jerome S. Bruner, **The Process of Education,** Harvard University Press (Cambridge 1960), pp. 76-77.

6—Robert L. Green and Thomas J. Stachnik, in "Money, Motivation And Academic Achievement," quoted by Susan Jacoby in the **Washington Post** (April 18, 1968).

7—A prime example is "The Case For Latin," by William Riley Parker, in **PMLA** (September 1964) and available in reprint from the MLA or the American Classical League's Service Bureau at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio 45056.

BY-LAWS

of the

Southern Conference on Language Teaching, Incorporated

Name

1. This Corporation shall be known as "The Southern Conference On Language Teaching, Incorporated."

Object

2. This Corporation is organized for the purpose of advancing the study of languages on all levels of instruction.

Methods of Operation

3. The achievement of the stated object of the Corporation shall be pursued through research, reports, dissemination and implementation of more effective approaches to the study of languages. This work will be carried out by the Board of Directors or individuals appointed by the Board, and by such other means as the Board may choose.

Offices

4. The offices of the Corporation are located at Converse College, 580 East Main Street, Spartanburg, South Carolina.

Seal

5. The corporate seal of the Corporation shall have inscribed thereon the name of the Corporation, and the year and State of its incorporation.

Meetings

6. The annual meeting of members of the Corporation shall be held in a place designated by the Board of Directors on the first Saturday of February each year at twelve o'clock noon, unless the

Board of Directors shall, not less than sixty days prior thereto, appoint a different place and time, and shall give not less than thirty days' notice thereof to members of the Corporation.

7. At the annual meeting the members shall elect, by plurality vote, three members of the Board of Directors, who shall serve for four years and until their successors are elected. The incorporators shall elect, from among the number of those deemed by them to be qualified, twelve Board members in four classes of three persons each, to serve for terms ending respectively at the annual meetings of 1969, 1970, 1971, and 1972, and they shall be replaced seriatim by the three members of the Board of Directors elected at each annual meeting as aforesaid. Members of the Board of Directors may be re-elected to that Board only after an interim of one year.

8. Special meetings of the members of the Corporation may be called by the Chairman or by direction of the Board of Directors, upon written notice, stating the day, hour, and place of the meeting and the general nature of the business to be transacted, and mailed to each member at least thirty days prior to such meeting.

9. Those members of the Corporation present in person, or represented by proxy, shall constitute a quorum for the election of Board of Director members or for the transaction of other business.

10. There shall be a minimum of two regular meetings of the Board of Directors annually, the first of which will take place at the close of the annual meeting of the Corporation. Members of the Board who fail to attend two consecutive meetings may be removed by the Board of Directors. Written notice of the second regular annual meeting, stating the day, hour and place of the meeting and the general nature of the business to be transacted shall be mailed to each member of the Board of Directors at least one month prior to such meeting.

11. Each member of the Corporation shall be entitled to one vote, either in person or by proxy, on all questions or actions at all meetings of members.

12. Written notice of the annual meeting of the Corporation shall be mailed to each of its members at his address as the same appears on the books of the Corporation, at least thirty days prior to such meeting.

13. The proxies shall be filed with the Secretary of the Corporation before being voted.

Sponsors and Their Representatives

14. Any non-profit institution or non-profit organization interested in the advancement of the study of languages may, upon the payment of a contribution of $25.00 or more, become a sponsor of the Southern Conference On Language Teaching for the current year. Each such sponsor shall have the right to name an official representative for the current year; such representative shall be a member of the Advisory Board for so long as the designating institution or organization continues as a sponsor and continues to name him as its official representative. Any non-profit institution or organization that contributes $50.00 or more may become a patron with the right to name two official representatives. The names of the sponsors and patrons, together with those of their official representatives, shall be printed in the Conference Program and in the Proceedings.

Membership

15. The members of the Corporation shall be the members of the Advisory Board; any person whose membership on such Board or Council shall cease, shall **ipso facto** cease to be a member of the Corporation. The Board of Directors shall have the power, by majority vote, to appoint individuals with special qualifications to the Advisory Board.

Officers and Board of Directors

16. At the first meeting of the Board of Directors following the annual meeting of the Corporation, the Board shall elect from among its members a Chairman, a Vice-Chairman, and a Secretary-Treasurer to serve for one year and until their successors are elected. Officers may succeed themselves. The Chairman, upon election, shall appoint an Editor, a Recording Secretary, a Membership Chairman, and a Local Chairman, to serve for one year and until their successors are appointed. Vacancies in the Board of Directors may continue, but in no case shall the number on the Board be less than nine. The initial complement of officers shall be elected by the incorporators from among persons deemed by them to be qualified.

State Committee

17. The Board of Directors shall appoint a person from each of the States and territories to be known as the State Chairman for the Southern Conference On Language Teaching, who in turn will appoint two other persons to serve with him as a State Committee. This Committee will represent, at the state level, the aims and goals of the Southern Conference On Language Teaching. The State Chairman will automatically become a member of the Advisory Board. This paragraph is not intended to limit in any way the scope and activity of the Southern Conference On Language Teaching.

Registrants

18. Any person, not a member of the Corporation, who is interested in the advancement of the study of languages may, upon the payment of the current registration fee as set by the Board of Directors, become a registrant for the current year. Each registrant may attend all meetings of the Conference, with the exception of the meetings, regular or special, of the members of the Corporation, and the Board of Directors.

Powers of Board of Directors

19. The Board of Directors shall have the management of the Corporation's business. In addition to the powers expressly conferred by these By-Laws, the Board of Directors may exercise all such powers and do all such lawful acts as are not by statute or by these By-Laws directed or required to be exercised by members of the Corporation.

20. Without limitation of the foregoing the Board of Directors may also appoint such committees and delegate to them such powers respectively as they deem proper; and they may also appoint any person or corporation to accept and hold in trust for the Corporation property belonging to it, or in which it is interested, and to make, execute and deliver such instruments and perform all such duties as may be necessary or proper in relation to any such trust.

The Chairman and Vice-Chairman

21. The Chairman shall, with the advice of the Board of Directors, plan the forthcoming Conference, sign official papers and documents of the Corporation, and preside at meetings of the Board

of Directors and at the annual meeting of the Corporation. In case of his absence, resignation, or death, his duties shall be performed by the Vice-Chairman.

The Recording Secretary

22. The Recording Secretary shall keep a record of all proceedings of the Board of Directors and meetings of the Corporation.

The Secretary-Treasurer

23. The Secretary-Treasurer shall maintain the permanent records of the Corporation and shall maintain an office for same. His duties shall be as assigned by the Board of Directors. He shall attest by his signature and the Corporation's seal all official documents. He shall maintain permanent fiscal records of the Corporation. He shall be custodian of and receive and disburse moneys, bonds, notes and other securities and properties of the Corporation. He shall give a bond when required by the Board for the official business of the Corporation. He shall receive such compensation and dispense such office accounts as shall be approved annually by the Board of Directors.

Vacancies

24. If the office of any member of the Board of Directors, or of the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Secretary-Treasurer, one or more, becomes vacant, by reason of death, resignation, disqualification, or otherwise, the remaining Board members, even though less than a quorum, by a majority vote, may choose a successor or successors, who shall hold office for the unexpired term.

Resignation

25. Any Board member or other officer may resign his office at any time, such resignation to be made in writing, and to take effect from the time of its receipt by the Corporation, unless some time to be fixed in the resignation, and then from that date. The acceptance of a resignation shall not be required to make it effective.

Nominating Committee

26. There shall be a Nominating Committee consisting of three members, elected annually by the Board of Directors from among its

number. The report of the Nominating Committee shall be published at least eight weeks in advance of the annual meeting. Other nominations shall require the signature of twenty-five members and must be reported to the Secretary at least four weeks in advance of the annual meeting.

Board of Directors

27. Special meetings of the Board of Directors may be held at the call of the Chairman or at the request of six members of the Board, on fifteen days' notice to each Board member.

28. The Chairman may, with the consent of the Board of Directors, appoint persons to serve as consultants to the Corporation. Such persons, so appointed, shall be invited to attend meetings of the Board of Directors of the Corporation, and may be reimbursed for their expenses in so doing; they may participate, without vote, in all discussions.

29. At least eight members of the Board of Directors shall be present in person at any meeting to constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

30. At each annual meeting of the Corporation the Board shall present an annual report of the progress of the Corporation.

Amendment

31. The members of the Corporation, by the affirmative vote of a majority of those present, may at the annual meeting, or at any special meeting, alter or amend these By-Laws, provided that such alteration or amendment has been proposed at the previous meeting of the Corporation or has been submitted in writing to the members of the Corporation by the Board of Directors at least thirty days prior to such annual or special meeting.

PATRONS:		Representatives:
American Assoc. of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese		John E. Keller
Assoc. of Foreign Languages of S. C. Education Assoc.		Janet Redicker Richard Fowler
Atlanta Public Schools	Atlanta, Ga.	J. W. Letson
Converse College	Spartanburg, S. C.	Sanford Newell Elisabeth Epting
Florida Chapter, Amer. Assoc. of Teachers of French	Miami, Fla.	Carroll Naves Lois Boggs
University of Georgia	Athens, Ga.	Theodore Kalivoda Robert Elkins
University of Kentucky	Lexington, Ky.	Jean Charron George Denemark
Memphis State University	Memphis, Tenn.	Grant Reese Arthur Dailey
Miami-Dade Junior College	Miami, Fla.	Charlotte Parraga Karl Pond
New Orleans Public Schools	New Orleans, La.	Charles Hancock Hanes Morris
Princeton University	Princeton, N. J.	André Maman Edward Sullivan
Richland County School Dist. 1 Columbia Public Schools	Columbia, S. C.	Jeanne Palyok Janet Redicker
Tennessee A & I State Univ.	Nashville, Tenn.	Joan Elliott Wendolyn Bell
Tulane University	New Orleans, La.	William Smither George Wilkins

SPONSORS:		Representatives:
Agnes Scott College	Decatur, Ga.	Gunther Bicknese
Alabama State College	Montgomery, Ala	Roscoe Thomas
American Assoc. of Teachers of German	Allentown, Pa.	Adolph Wegener
Appalachian State University	Boone, N. C.	Carline Howell
Atlanta University	Atlanta, Ga.	Benjamin Hudson
Auburn High School	Auburn, Ala.	Charlotte Ottis
Baptist College of Charleston	Charleston, S. C.	Judson Spence
Bellarmine College	Louisville, Ky.	Thomas McTigue
Belmont Abbey College	Belmont, N. C.	Marie-Louise Rahier
Brevard College	Brevard, N. C.	Mario Perez
Centre d'Etudes Françaises d'Amboise	Amboise, France	Elaine Breault

SPONSORS:		Representatives:
Clemson University	Clemson, S. C.	Patricia Wannamaker
Duval County Council of Foreign Language Teachers	Jacksonville, Fla.	James Schrenker
Ecole de l'Alliance Française d'Atlanta	Atlanta, Ga.	Nora Saporta
Fisk University	Nashville, Tenn.	James Lawson
Florida State University	Tallahassee, Fla.	Phillip Leamon
Fort Valley State College	Fort Valley, Ga.	O. E. Hicks
Fulton County Board of Education	Atlanta, Ga.	Miriam Felder
Gaston College	Gastonia, N. C.	Hugo Duarte
Georgia State College	Atlanta, Ga.	Shubael Beasley
University of Guelph	Guelph, Ontario, Can.	R. A. Barrell
Huntsville High School	Huntsville, Ala.	Arlene Darby
Isidore Newman School	New Orleans, La.	Elizabeth Mann
Jacksonville University	Jacksonville, Fla.	Marta Perez
A. R. Johnson Jr. High School	Augusta, Ga.	Jane Hollis
Johnson C. Smith University	Charlotte, N. C.	Nigel Ayton
Lander College	Greenwood, S. C.	Howard Bateson
Leon High School	Tallahassee, Fla.	Lois Boggs
Longwood College	Farmville, Va.	Frances Garnjost
La. State University in New Orleans	New Orleans, La.	Marie LaGarde
Loyola University	New Orleans, La.	Mrs. R. H. Ross
Marion Institute	Marion, Ala.	K. W. Fix
Mars Hill College	Mars Hill, N. C.	Gwyndola Fish
McGill University French Summer School	Montreal, Quebec, Canada	Maurice Rabotin
Memphis University School	Memphis, Tenn.	Ross Lynn
Miles College	Birmingham, Ala.	Michael Lubic
Morris Brown College	Atlanta, Ga.	Julia Jackson
Murray State University	Murray, Ky.	James Parr
National Assoc. of Language Laboratory Directors		Louis Chatagnier
Univ. of N. C. at Charlotte	Charlotte, N. C.	Edward Hopper
Northwestern State College of La.	Nachitoches, La.	Eve Mouton
Oglethorpe College	Atlanta, Ga.	Arthur Bieler
Ohio State University	Columbus, Ohio	
Presbyterian College	Clinton, S. C.	Yvonne Tapson King

SPONSORS:		Representatives:
Rayville High School	Rayville, La.	Sarah Thomason
St. Andrews Presbyterian College	Laurinburg, N. C.	Carl Geffert
St. Mary's Dominican High School	New Orleans, La.	Sister M. Magdalen Lopinto
Samford University	Birmingham, Ala.	Max Gartman
University of South Alabama	Mobile, Ala.	Robert Owens
Southern Missionary College	Collegedale, Tenn.	Robert Morrison
Southern Univ. and A&M College	Baton Rouge, La.	Helen Little
Spartanburg City Schools	Spartanburg, S. C.	Richard Fowler
Spartanburg Day School	Spartanburg, S. C.	Jack Bray
Tennessee Technological University	Cookeville, Tenn.	James Stewart
University of Tennessee	Knoxville, Tenn.	Jacqueline Elliott
Univ. of Tennessee at Martin	Martin, Tenn.	Muriel Tomlinson
Univ. of Texas	Austin, Texas	Theodore Andersson
Tuscaloosa High School	Tuscaloosa, Ala.	Ellen Riley
Wakulla County Schools	Crawfordville, Fla.	Ann Burks
West Georgia College	Carrollton, Ga.	Lucy Ann Neblett
Westminster Schools	Atlanta, Ga.	Olympia Sotolongo
W. L. Yancey State Jr. College	Bay Minette, Ala.	Charlotte Owens

EXHIBITORS and ADVERTISERS

American College in Paris and American Pre-College Program in Paris
American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages
American Institute for Foreign Study
American Seating Co.
AMSCO Publishing Co.
The Bruce Publishing Co.
Center of Intercultural Documentation
Centre d'Etudes Françaises d'Amboise
Center for Applied Linguistics
Charles E. Merrill Books
Charles Scribner's Sons
Chilton Books
Educational Electronics of La.-Miss.
Encyclopaedia Britannica Educational Corp.
Foreign Language League Schools, Inc.
French Book Guild
Gessler Publishing Co.
Goldsmith's Music Shop, Inc.
Hachette-Paris
Hamilton College French Summer School
Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.
D. C. Heath and Co., Div. of Raytheon Education Co.
Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
Interstate School Supply Co., Inc.
Las Americas Publishing Co.
McGraw-Hill Book Co.
National Textbook Corporation
Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages
Prentice-Hall, Inc.
Random House, Inc.
Regents Publishing Co.
Scholastic Magazines, Inc.
TUTOR Applied Linguistics Centre
Wible Language Institute